

62

IMPAR CONATUI:
OR,
Mr. J. B. the Author of an ANSWER
TO THE
ANIMADVERSIONS
ON THE
Dean of St. Paul's Vindication of the
TRINITY, Rebuk'd and Prov'd

TO BE WHOLLY
Unfit for the Great Work he hath Undertaken.

WITH
Some Account of the Late Scandalous *Animadversions* on
Mr. Hill's BOOK, Intituled,
A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers against the
Imputations of Gilbert Lord Bishop of Sarum, &c.

In a Letter to the Reverend Mr. R. E.

By **THOMAS HOLDSWORTH, M. A.**
Rector of North-Stoneham near Southampton.

*Quare desine jam tibi videri,
Quod soli tibi, Cecili, videris ;
Qui Galbam salibus tuis, & ipsum
Possis vincere Sestium Caballum.*

M. Val. Mart. Epig. Lib. 1. Ep. 36.

L O N D O N,
Printed for *William Keblewhite*, at the Swan in St. Paul's
Church-Yard, MDC XCV.

TO THE
R E A D E R.

U Pon the Perusal of the following
Papers sent to me into the Country
to note the Errata of the Press
(which are many and bad) I found one or
two of my own. The first is in the last
Line but two of p. 5. where I speak of an
Enthymem as a Syllogism with two Terms
and no more: Which Mistake I was un-
warily betray'd into, by considering too
slightly, and inferring too rashly, that be-
cause an Enthymem is always under the
Defect of a Major or a Minor Proposition,
therefore it wanted a Major or a Minor
Term, and consequently had but two Terms.
But this the Reader (if he please to be so
candid to me) may impute to that Inad-
vertency and want of critical Care, which
is usual enough in a private Letter to a
Friend,

216

TO the READER.

Friend, as this was only design'd when this Mistake escap'd me; or he may pardon it to a Country Retirement from the University, and to a Desuetude of the syllogizing Practice for more than twenty Tears. The second (or rather what may seem to be so without a Caution) is in p. 27. at the Bottom of which I say, that Mr. J. B. will not find so much as one honest Man, that will tell him, that the Father here [viz. 1 Cor. 8. 6.] is taken, as he takes the Word before, hypostatically, for the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. In which Words, I am sensible, I express myself somewhat too generally and loosely. And therefore I think fit to declare here (to prevent Cavil if I can) that I know well that many honest, Learned Men do take the Word [Father] here, hypostatically, as 'tis oppos'd to and distinguish'd from the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity [the one Lord Jesus Christ] in the End of the Verse: But, as Mr. J. B. urges it

TO the READER.

it Pref. p. 10. as the Word [Father] relates to the Words immediately precedent [to us] and to the Words immediately subsequent [of whom are All things] in this Sense it is (as the Word [Father] in the Text stands thus related) that I desire what I say in p. 27. may be understood: And in this Sense I thought it to be plain and certain, that it is to be taken essentially: But if not, this I am very sure of, that Mr. J. B's Argument, which I there undertake, is never a whit the better for't. Many other Mistakes, I am not secure but the Learned and Judicious Reader or Mr. J. B. may find me guilty of: Of none, I hope, that are dangerous or scandalous, or in the least prejudicial to the Holy Catholick Faith, or to my Holy Mother the Church of England. But whatever they may be, I resolve, by the Grace of God, (as soon as ever I shall be convinced of them) to make what Amends and Satisfaction I can, by owning my Offence, either

To the READER.

ther by *Silence* or by a publick *Retraction*, as the Nature of it shall require. And I hope Mr. J. B. (if he cannot fairly answer and clear himself from what I have objected against him) instead of ingaging himself any further in this sublime Controversy (for the Management of which I think I have prov'd him to be, what, God knows, I think my self to be, *Very Unfit*) will be so ingenuous, and have such a tender Regard for the Honour of our Holy Church and Religion (if he be really for it) as to do so too.

E R R A T A.

THE Reader is desired to take Notice of, and correct the following Errata; some of which quite alter the Sense, and some disturb it. Page 5 line 18 for *Rarety* r. *Rarity*, and l. 29 read thus, *Syllogismus Truncatus? Triangulum Truncatum*, l. &c. p. 9 l. 21, 22. r. *J. B.* p. 10 l. 3 f. *pert* r. *great*, and l. 24 f. in r. *is*. p. 13 l. 22 f. *other* r. *their*. p. 19 l. 25 f. *qui* r. *qua*. p. 21 l. 11 f. *Admirable* r. *Adorable*. p. 22 l. 20 f. *oxlois* r. *oxlois*. p. 25 l. 26 dele *is* before *to*. p. 28 l. 16 f. *vice* r. *voce*. p. 29 l. 26 after *Adversary*, add *doth not*. p. 31 l. 16 r. of *a*. p. 33 l. 16 f. *is* r. *is*, and l. 22 f. on r. *in*. p. 40 l. 14 f. *illo* r. *ille*. p. 44 l. 15 r. *Solecism*. p. 49 l. 14 dele [*or*] before [*that*] p. 52 l. 18 r. *tells* *us*, and l. 28 r. *Father's* being. p. 60 l. 5 f. *quam* r. *quum*. p. 72 l. 27 r. *a* *vast*. Several Mispointings there are which are left to the Judgment of the Reader.

S I R,

I Intended you these Papers, according to my Promise, much sooner. But besides the Indisposition I was under to write last Week (brought upon me, I fear, by our willful Journeying almost all Night from a good House and the best Company) the Answer of Mr. J. B. A. M. to the Animadversions on the Dean of St. Paul's Vindication of the Trinity, is to me such a woful Example of *Hasty Births*, that you will pardon me, I hope, if the Fear of Abortion, of such a dangerous, scandalous Miscarriage as Mr. J B's whole Book is, hath made me go a Fortnight beyond my Reckoning.

Mr. J. B. begins His Preface to the Reader with a very true and congruous Observation, That *Hasty Births commonly are imperfect*: And never, I think, was it more truly and fully Exemplify'd than by His own Deform'd Creature, this His Embryo of a Book. And whether He be in earnest or no, when He says, That He *hath reason to fear the Imperfections of it*, I nothing doubt, but Time and the Animadverter (if He doth not think so Sorry an Author too much beneath Him,

Scilicet à magnis ad T E descendere Tauris)

will quickly make it appear, That He hath much more Reason for such a Fear than He is aware of.

As a Prelibation of what I dare promise you'll have a full Draught hereafter, I shall, as I promised you, Examine this Doughty Champion's Preface, not the former

B

Part

* 2 Sam. 20.
9, 10.

Part of it, in which He flourishes with an Account of the rare Exploits and mighty Atchievements of His Book (for that will belong to the Examiner of His Book) but the latter Part of it, in which, as Joab did Amasa, * *He takes the Animadverter by the Beard, and smites Him in the fifth Rib, and cracks and bounces, as if with His keen Ironies and blunt Charges, and blunter Arguments, He had kill'd Him dead, as if neither He nor any Body else should ever have any more Occasion to strike Him again.*

For He proves Him, Pref. p. 8. *to be blind past all Remedy, blinder than the Dean's Son at the University, the meanest Sophister of a Year's standing (which by the way, as He hath express'd Himself, is a Complement upon the Dean's Son; for which the Dean and His Son cannot but think Themselves much oblig'd to Him) that He wants to be taught the first Rudiments of Logick: That He is a Person of no Logick at all: That 'tis plain He doth not yet know the Predicate and Subject of a Proposition, p. 9. That in Divinity He is not only guilty of Error, but downright Blasphemy, such blasphemous Stuff, that the modest good Man cannot relate it without Blushing, p. 10. and this Blasphemy is the Consequence of His great Ignorance of the receiv'd Language of the Church, p. 12. that He is so ignorant, as if He had never read the Scriptures, never learn'd His Catechism, nay not his Creed, p. 10. Poor Animadverter!*

Omnibus Invidias, Livide, Nemo Tibi.

Now, Sir, I cannot deny but that the Animadverter hath been much Declaim'd against as an Envious, Proud, Ill-natur'd, Scurrilous Person; and I must needs say, if he had not been too much so, He could not have treated so great and good a Man, and of such excellent Parts (as the Dean of St. Paul's certainly is, and is generally and justly allow'd to be) with so much Scorn and Contempt,
so

so rudely and unchristianly. But I am sure you will agree with me, That as bad as the Animadverter is or can be represented to be, by His greatest Enemies, it was never heard before, that He was so incomparably Ignorant, such an egregious Blockhead as this Mr. J. B. attempts to prove Him: But on the contrary was always, when in the University and since, allow'd to be a Man of great Wit and Parts, and a well Educated and well Studied Scholar.

And therefore, Mr. J. B. in Treating and Representing the Animadverter at this boisterous Rate, doth either justify the Animadverter in His Usage of the Dean of *St. Paul's*, or doth expose and condemn Himself for being as Bad and as Impudent at least as He paints the Animadverter: And doth by it reduce Himself to another unlucky Dilemma, That either all others are Fools and mistaken in their Notions of the Animadverter, or He Himself is so in His Character of Him: Such a Character as was never before given Him, and with Truth and Conscience never can: A Character that reflects rudely and undutifully upon the University and upon the Church, and (which, I doubt, He was not well aware of) most severely upon Himself. For by this Character which He so weakly and vainly endeavours to prove and fix upon the Animadverter, He strongly proves and effectually discovers, that 'tis He Himself is the Man to whom in good earnest, and with too much Truth it belongs.

That this is so, I think, I shall be able to make appear to you very plainly and fully, by Attacking this Gentleman in His strongest Works, in the Five or Six last Pages of His Preface; in which He takes all the Advantages against the Animadverter that possibly He can, singles out Two or Three Passages out of His whole Book of *Tritbeism Charg'd*, &c. which He thinks to be the weakest and most indefensible; and then plays upon Him, with

all His Might, His whole Artillery. And here, one would think, if ever, He should do the Animadverter's Business, as He thinks He has done: But that now shall be try'd.

Three things He sets upon the Animadverter for. The First is produc'd as *an Instance of the Animadverter's profound Judgment in the Science*, as He calls it, *of Logick*; after which, He says, *He will conclude his Epistle*, Pref. p. 7. Though after this, before He concludes, He produces Two distinct Instances more, to convict Him of Absurdity, Heterodoxy and Blasphemy in Divinity, and stupid Ignorance in Logick: Which Two distinct Instances too He calls but One, Pref. p. 10. from whence, I doubt not, if He had made such a Discovery in the Animadverter, He would presently have cried out and Inferred for certain, that this ignorant Animadverter could not tell Twenty; that the Animadverter was so very ignorant, that He knew not that Two and One made Three, or that One added to One made Two. But I am not willing (and have no need) to make such Inferences: and I wish they were less frequent in Mr. J. B. and others.

As for the Animadverter's *Profound Judgment*, by which this Catechrestical Man means His Profound Ignorance, *in the Science*, forsooth, *of Logick*, That is plain to a Demonstration, as plain, as that there cannot be a Triangle with Two Sides only, or a Square with Three.

For says Mr. J. B. very wittily and shrewdly, *A Syllogism with two Terms and no more, is a Triangle with two Sides only, or a Square with three. Bless me! thought I, what doth this Man mean? The least he can mean is, That a Syllogism with two Terms and no more, is as absurd and impossible, as a Triangle with two Sides only, or a Square with three. If so, then here's a Mathematical Demonstration for you, Sir, That this naughty, ignorant Animadverter doth the Reverend Dean much Wrong. For how can the Reverend Dean make a Syllogism with two*
Terms.

Terms and no more, when the thing is as impossible as a Triangle with two Sides only, or a Square with three? For a Syllogism with two Terms and no more ('tis no better nor worse) is a Triangle, &c.

Upon my Word, Sir, this is a notable cunning Way to clear the Dean, and becoming the Acumen of Mr. J. B. very well.

But what now, If a Syllogism with two Terms and no more, be not a Triangle with two Sides only, or a Square with three; but do as vastly differ, as that which is not only possible but very easie, usual and common, differs from that which is utterly impossible? What then? why then 'tis one Demonstration, that Mr. J. B. is not the Man some Folks may take Him to be.

If you know, Sir, how to direct to this Mr. J. B. (for I do not) let me beg the Favour of you to write to Him, that your Friend T. H. if he hath any Occasion for such a Rarity as He thought was impossible to be had for Love or Money, hath a Thousand Syllogisms at His Service, and each Syllogism (you may pawn your Honour for Him if you please) shall have but two Terms and no more (and I question not but the Reverend Dean of St. Paul's hath so many more at His Service) and all that He expects in Return, is, That Mr. J. B. if possibly He can, would be so kind to Him as to oblige Him but with one Poor Triangle with two Sides only, or a Square with three, which He pleases, or can best afford.

Did this learned Logician never hear of such a thing as *Syllogismus Truncatus*, *Triangulum Truncatum*? I am sure He never did. Can this J. B. be A. M. and never hear of a Syllogism call'd an Enthymem? Or not know that an Enthymem is a Syllogism with two Terms and no more? And is an Enthymem therefore a Triangle with two Sides only?

But

But Mr. *J. B.* you'll say, means a Syllogism of three Propositions, such as the Dean's is ; and that 'tis as impossible for such a Syllogism to have but two Terms and no more, as it is for a Triangle to have but two Sides : Why then is Mr. *J. B.* so very impertinent, as to take up a Page or two, to prove that which is impossible to be otherwise ?

But if it be as impossible for a Syllogism of three Propositions to have but two Terms, as it is for a Triangle to have but two Sides only ; what will Mr. *J. B.* say of a Syllogism of three Propositions, and but of one Term only ?

* If a Rule be a Rule, then a Rule is a Rule ; but a Rule is a Rule, ergo, &c. And yet such a Syllogism, to the best of my Remembrance (for I have not the Book by me) He may find in the First Volume of the late A. B. *Tillotson's* Sermons in the Preface against *J. S.* *

A Syllogism indeed of three Propositions with two Terms and no more, is a very naughty, vicious Syllogism ; but if it will therefore follow, that 'tis a Triangle with two Sides only, I'll undertake to prove, when you please, that Mr. *J. B.* Himself is a Triangle with two Sides only. For why will it not as well follow, that a naughty, vicious Disputant (the worst that ever Water wet) as Mr. *J. B.* is, is, for being so, a Triangle with two Sides only, as that a naughty, vicious Syllogism is so ? The worst that can be said of a Syllogism with two Terms and no more, is, that it is a very bad, false Syllogism ; but yet a Syllogism still it is, as much as *J. B.* is a Disputant, as false and as bad as he is ; and it implies, I'll justify it no more a Contradiction (as a Triangle with two Sides only certainly doth) to say that a Syllogism is with two Terms only, than to say, that Mr. *J. B.* is a Disputant.

In a Word, If we will take Mr. *J. B's* ignorant, foolish Fancy (for such it is) in a more candid Sense than it will well bear ; if, that is, it should be granted that by a Syllogism's

Syllogism's being a Triangle with two Sides only, He means no more by it, than that it is a faulty, vicious Syllogism, then let the Reverend Dean look to Himself; for if to be a faulty, vicious Syllogism is to be a Triangle with two sides only, then such a Triangle hath Mr. J. B. made the Reverend Dean's Syllogism to be. For whether the Animadverter can make good, what he says, that His Syllogism hath two Terms and no more or no, that I will not meddle with: Let the Animadverter look to't. But this, I think, I may be very sure of, that His blessed Defender hath defended it into a Syllogism utterly indefensible by any of the allow'd Rules of Logick: And this, I doubt not, I shall prove to you to your Satisfaction.

This is the Dean's Syllogism. " Three distinct infinite intelligent Persons are three Gods: But there are not three distinct Gods: And therefore, there are not three distinct infinite intelligent Persons in the God-head. "

After the Repetition of which Syllogism, thus begins the Puissant J. B. *The Major of this Proposition is false. Bless me! thought I, will this Man deny the Four and Twenty Letters? Did you ever, Sir, in all your days before, hear the Major of a Proposition denied? How might I expostulate with this great Logician in His own Words, in the last Paragraph of this Page? I turn'd over with great speed to the Errata, thinking I might find another Word for Proposition, but finding none, I will hope in Charity that 'tis the Fault of the Press; and that 'tis the Major of this Syllogism, which He would say is false: But what other Fault to find with it, that He declares, was past His Skill in Logick. Alas! who can help J. B's Blindness? The Reverend Dean's Son at the University, though He should be the meanest Sophister of a Year's standing (which I hope He is not, unless He hath the ill Luck to have such an A. M. as J. B. for His Tutor) could have told this profound*

found Logician and Philosopher, that as He has manag'd *this innocent Syllogism* (as He calls it) besides that the Major Proposition is false, it is so far from being a good Syllogism and having no other Fault, that it is utterly false and indefensible, as a Syllogism, by any of the allow'd Rules in Logick: And that though *He is asbamed* forsooth! (as He fondly says He is) to *spend His Reader's Time and abuse His Patience, to teach this great Dictator in Philosophy and Divinity* [the Animadverter] *the First Rudiments of Logick*; yet 'tis He Himself is such an arrogant silly Dictator as wants to be taught the First Rudiments of Logick, if ever any Simpleton of a Dictator did. For there is not a Freshman in the University of but a quarter of a Year's standing, if any due Care has been taken of Him, but can tell this huffing *Thraso*, that, besides the Major, Minor and Middle-Term, which is but the remote Matter of a Syllogism, every Categorical Syllogism must have its Form, which consists in Mood and Figure; and if it be not of such or such a Figure, which is a due, regular Disposol of the Middle-Term with the two Extrems, which are the Parts of the Question, the Freshman will tell Him (and both the Universities will justifie Him in it) that the Syllogism cannot be without Fault (whether *J. B.* sees it or no) but must be vicious.

Let us see now how this glorious Defender of the Dean will dispose of this Middle-Term which He has found out: For there's a pretty Instrument in Logick, you know, call'd *Pons Asinorum*, which may help a poor Man, upon Occasion, to the Middle-Term, but the Craft is in disposing it aright; or else He will never make a good Syllogism but by Chance.

It is clear, says our Champion, [*Three distinct Gods*] *is the Middle-Term as not entring the Conclusion*. Well, and what then? Why then, having made this notable Discovery, the next thing to be done, is to secure a Major
and

and a Minor: And to that end, by the Help of honest *Dutrien* (a little Book that a Man may almost venture to swear he never read, or understood, or hath forgot) *the Verb Substantive est or sunt in Latin* [to distinguish it, I suppose from the Verb Substantive *est* or *sunt* in Greek or Hebrew, or some other Tongue in which the Verb Substantive *est* or *sunt* may not be so serv'd] *is in these Cases, Resolvendum hoc modo, est existens, sunt existentes;* so says *Dutrien, Logica, p. 3.*

What Pity it is, That a Man who seems to have read no farther in Logick than to the third Page in *Dutrien*, should be so ill-advis'd, as to be shewing his Skill in Logick against the Learned Animadverter. For if he had read any farther, or any other Logick, he could not well be ignorant, that there's no Necessity at all of thus *Resolving the Conclusion of the Dean's Syllogism* to make a Major and a Minor. It had as much a Major and a Minor before it was thus resolv'd, as since; and, to use His own Words, *None but a Person of no Logick could be ignorant of it.*

Mr. *J. B's est*, is as much a Proposition, and bath as much a Subject and a Predicate, as Mr. *J. B's est talis qualis*. For *est secundi adjecti* is altogether as sufficient for a Proposition, as when it is the mere verbal *Copula*, or *est tertii adjecti*; nay, it makes the Proposition more large and comprehensive, that is, more Affirmative and Negative: And therefore nothing but gross Ignorance, which as the wise Man says, * maketh a certain sort of Creature * Prov. 14.16. to rage and be confident; nothing but this could have suffer'd this foolish Man to insult the Animadverter, as he doth here in his last Paragraph, p. 8.

The Animadverter, no doubt, knows still, what he did, I believe, Forty Years ago, that there may be a Proposition Affirmative or Negative with *est secundi adjecti*, as well as with *est tertii*; and that He hath no Occasion at

all for *est tertii adjecti*, to prevent the Dean's Conclusion from being a *Marriage of a Man to himself*. Every simple Christian, without *J. B.*'s pert Learning, knows that two are enough to make a Match, if they can be married, and are not within the prohibited Degrees: And therefore he had no Occasion at all to go to Father *Dutrieu*, to give [Are not Existent] to be married to [three distinct, &c.] In Reverence I forbear to speak it out.

But when all is done, let him do what he can for his Life, he can never make a Marriage of it. For the Dean's Conclusion, being a Negative Proposition, is rather a Divorce than a Marriage: So *Petrus à sancto Joseph* will tell Him [in *Log. lib. 2. cap. 2.*] *In Propositionibus Negativis Verbum medium non satis propriè videtur dici Copula, cum non uniat inter se extrema, sed potius illa sepatet.* So unlucky is this Mr. *J. B.* in his parabolical Wit. * *The*

* Prov. 26. 7.

Legs of the Lame are not equal: So —————

Well, but now Mr. *J. B.* (his Modesty notwithstanding) hath taught the Animadverter his *First Rudiments in Logick*, and told him how the *Verb Substantive est or sunt in Latin* is to be resolv'd, and that the Conclusion of the Reverend Dean's Syllogism is resolv'd into this, viz. and therefore three distinct, infinite, intelligent Persons in the Godhead are not existing; and that the Term existing in the third Term in this Syllogism, and to be supplied in this Syllogism both in the Minor Proposition and Conclusion, and that none but a Person of no Logick could have been ignorant of it; now then, after this sharp Reprimand and Lecture, the Animadverter is to take the Dean's Syllogism in its Perfection, according to the Second Edition of it, by Mr. *J. B.* Thus;

Three distinct, infinite, intelligent Persons are three Gods:

But three distinct Gods are not existing:

And

(II)

And therefore three distinct, infinite, intelligent Persons are not existing.

Now I desire to know what Figure this Syllogism is of? It cannot be of the First: For then [three distinct Gods] which is allow'd to be the Middle Term, must be the Subject in the Major Proposition and the Predicate in the Minor. It cannot be of the Second, for then the Middle Term must be the Predicate of the Minor as well as of the Major. It cannot be of the Third, for then the Middle Term must be the Subject both of Major and Minor. And therefore I know no Remedy for him, if he will have his Syllogism of any Figure at all, but to go to Old *Galen*, and to give him his Fee for a Fourth: And if according to that, he can justifie that the Major Term may be the Subject of the Conclusion, as he hath made it in his Syllogism, it may be worth his Money, for what I know. But if the *Major Terminus* be in all Syllogisms of the Fourth Figure, according to any of the Five Moods belonging to it, always the Predicate of the Conclusion, then neither can *Galen*, nothing can help him.

In every Syllogism of the Fourth Figure, the Minor Term is predicated of the Middle Term, and the Middle Term of the Major; so that the same Middle Term is a Major to the Major, and yet a Minor to the Minor, and so the Minor Term is made a Major to the Major; and yet because the Major Term is always in the Conclusion predicated of the Minor Term, it is a Major to the Minor, which, as *Scheibler* hath observ'd *, is as absurd, as if we should say, some Man is greater than *Goliath* and yet less than *David*: And therefore, saith he, *Nunquam audimus naturaliter differentes, tales quartæ Figuræ Syllogismos formare*; and the Fourth Figure by Logicians is generally Reprobated. ||

* Op. Log. de Syl. c. 5. Art. 2.

|| Vid. Averroem 1. prior. c. 8. in Comment. & Zabara in lib. de 4 Fig. Syllog. & interp. ad 1. prior.

But allowing it to be no Fault nor Discredit to a Syllogism to be of the Fourth Figure, yet to make the Minor Term, as he hath done, the Predicate of the Conclusion and the Major the Subject, is to make the Minor the Major, and the Major the Minor ; and this is such a Fault and Discredit to Mr. J. B. and his Syllogism, as will expose them to the Censure and Contempt of every Baby in Logick, and such as I never expect to see clear'd.

Having thus consider'd Mr. J. B's Syllogism for the Dean, let us next consider the Animadverter's for the Dean ; and we shall easily see, which, in this Matter, is the Dean's best Friend, and hath done him the best Service, Mr. J. B. or the Animadverter.

The Animadverter *sets it right for Him*, Thus ;

Three distinct, infinite, intelligent Persons are three distinct Gods : But Father, Son and Holy Ghost are not three distinct Gods ; and therefore Father, Son and Holy Ghost are not three infinite, intelligent Persons.

Now this is unquestionably a good Syllogism of the Second Figure, and is as much to the Dean's Purpose, as he can desire. But as plainly good as the Animadverter's Syllogism for the Dean and the Socinian is, and such as can be prov'd by Mood and Figure, yet Mr. J. B. to shew his Skill in Logick, is so hardy as to undertake to prove from it, to *make it plain, that the Animadvertiser does not yet know the Subject and Predicate of a Proposition.* Really, Sir, I must profess to you, that I think I never before met with any thing so very confident and so extremely ignorant in the Art of Reasoning as this Man is.

Here is a First and a Second (I cannot call 'em Reasons, I know not what to call 'em bad enough) advanc'd against the Syllogism as supply'd and perfected by the Animadverter.

First, *The Animadvertiser*, he says, *has chang'd the whole Syllogism.* Chang'd it indeed he has, and the Dean, if

if he pleases; may thank him for't: For he has, like a Man of Art, set it right for him, as he pretended: he has chang'd it from bad to good; from being infirm and liable to Exception, into a very sound, robust Constitution, such as cannot be shaken and expos'd. And what Harm, I pray, is there in all this? Ay! But the Animadverter has chang'd *the whole* Syllogism. Pray, Sir, look a little upon his Book and observe how he proves this, and you'll find that his whole Proof amounts to this and no more, *viz.* The Animadverter has chang'd the Conclusion of the Syllogism, *ergo* he has chang'd the whole Syllogism. But how has the Animadverter chang'd the Conclusion of the Dean's Syllogism? 'Tis certain, Mr. J. B. hath chang'd it with a Witness, and most absurdly, contrary to all Rules of Logick, hath made the Predicate of the Dean's Conclusion to be the Subject. But 'tis plain the Predicate, as it stands in the Dean's Conclusion and in the Animadverter's is the same; and I am somewhat inclin'd to think, that so is the Subject too, only in one 'tis understood and in the other 'tis express'd: And if Mr. J. B. and I were to wait on the Dean together to ask him, what Persons he means, and what be other Names whom he denies in His Conclusion to be three distinct, infinite, intelligent Persons: Do you not think, Sir, or rather are you not sure, that the Dean would be on my Side, and answer, That he means Father, Son and Holy Ghost? And then how would Mr. J. B. slouch? Then, I hope, the Animadverter hath not chang'd the Conclusion at all, but only made it more express.

Did ever this J. B. hear of any other distinct, infinite, intelligent Persons, (which the Orthodox assert and the Socinians deny) than Father, Son and Holy Ghost? And is it not then a very judicious, wise Remark and Exception, that the Dean in his Conclusion, *universally denies that there are any distinct, infinite, intelligent Persons in*
the

the Godhead; and that the Animadverter in his Conclusion only particularly denies that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are distinct, infinite, intelligent Persons? Certainly, nothing in the World can be more absurd and ridiculous than this whole Paragraph, except it be his next which follows.

Secondly, Then to prove [*to make it plain, very plain*] that this profound Logician [the Animadverter] who so often upbraids others with the want of Logick, does not yet know the Subject and Predicate of a Proposition, and that this great Critick (which one would hardly believe almost) though he was a long while the Celebrated Oratour for the University of Oxford, yet, is such a monstrous Blockhead, that he cannot construe a Sentence of the plainest Latin, unless Care be taken by Mr. J. B. to put the Words for him in their natural Order: For though the Subject commonly precedes the Verb or Copula, and the Predicate commonly follows, yet Learned, Able Mr. J. B. craves leave to tell this great Critick [the Animadverter] that the Rule is not Universal; and Mr. J. B. finds (for 'tis very plain) that the Animadverter never could tell, or cannot yet tell, when it fails. So that if the Predicate of a Proposition happens to stand before the Verb *est*, and the Subject to follow, the Animadverter is clearly gone; he cannot tell which is the Nominative Case that is to come before the Verb *est*, and which is to follow; that is, he cannot tell which is the Subject and which is the Predicate. Little did I think that this Animadverter had been such an arrant Dunce!

Now, I say, to prove all this, is as easie a thing with Mr. J. B. as 'tis for him to confute St. *Augustin*, and to make Fools of all the Schoolmen and Moderns.

Thus then he proves it; to which I beg you to attend a little, that you may see what a special A. M. this J. B. is, and how fit he is to engage in such a Controversy as he has undertaken.

In

*In the Conclusion, says he, of the last Syllogism (by which he means, and, in the next Line but one after, calls, the former Syllogism; which, by the way, every Man living of common Sense, must needs see to be Nonsense and a Contradiction) not the Subject but the Predicate was to be supplied: Three infinite, &c. Persons in the former Syllogism (which, as I observ'd, he just before calls the last Syllogism) was the Subject and not Predicate of the Conclusion: Whereas in the Animadverter's Syllogism, he has made three infinite Persons the Predicate; that is (and I appeal to your self and to all the World, whether I do not expound him fairly) because Mr. J. B. according to his excellent, unusual Skill in the Science of Logick, has made the Major Terminum [three distinct, infinite, &c.] of the Dean's Syllogism, to be the Subject of the Conclusion, which according to all the allow'd Rules of Logick ought to be the Predicate; and the Middle Term, being the Predicate of the Major, has made the Minor Term the Predicate both of the Minor Proposition and the Conclusion, and by so doing, has blindly expos'd his Syllogism as a defenceless, deform'd thing, to be ridicul'd and baffl'd by every little Sophister and Freshman of the Universities, and hath given full Proof to the World of his most scandalous, contemptible Ignorance in that which he so much pretends to: Whereas the Animadverter, in his Syllogism, has plac'd the Predicate exactly right, and according to the indisputable Rules of Art, plac'd all the three Terms of his Syllogism in their due, legitimate Order, according to the Second Figure; from whence what doth Mr. J. B. infer? Certainly, what could never enter into the Head of any Man but an J. B. From whence, says Mr. J. B. *is plain* (plain I dare swear not to any Man upon the Earth besides himself) *that this profound Logician* [the Animadverter] *who so often upbraids others with the want of Logick, Does not yet know the Subject and Predicate of a Proposition, &c. as before.* And*

And now, Sir, You cannot chuse, I am sure, but stand amaz'd at the Confidence and Ignorance of this *Thrase*, to see him, upon this, clapping his Wings and-crowing, as if there were no Remedy now for the Animadverter but to shoot the Pit, and to run and hide his Head, as a Man (he *perswades himself* by the mighty Force of his full and clear Evidence against him) *not easily to be forgotten or pardoned.*

But whether he hath more expos'd the Animadverter for *His Syllogism with two Terms, and a Proposition with one Term* (of neither of which doth it appear that the Animadverter is guilty) or himself, for *saying that a Syllogism with two Terms and no more, is a Triangle with two Sides only, or a Square with three: For denying the Major of a Proposition* (if it be not the Fault of the Press, which his palpable Ignorance may make a Doubt:) *For endeavouring to help the Dean out by changing a Proposition de Secundo Adjacente, into a Proposition de Tertio Adjacente, concerning which, he seems to understand nothing at all of the Matter: For making that to be a Marriage of a Subject and Predicate, which is plainly a Divorce: For making a reprobate Syllogism for the Dean of the Fourth Figure with a Conclusion inverted: For making the very same Syllogism in the same Respect to be the last, and the former beyond all Possibility of evading the Contradiction:* Whether, I say, Mr. J. B. hath more expos'd the Animadverter for what he doth not appear to be guilty of; or himself in these things, and much more in the Compass of two or three Pages, of which, I think, I may venture to say, I have prov'd him guilty; and which of the two will be most easily forgotten and pardoned, the *Insulting Animadverter with a Bottom, or Insulting J. B. with no Bottom*, I submit, Sir, to your correct Judgment and impartial Determination.

2. The Second thing the Animadverter is taken to task for, is his Absurdity, Heterodoxy, and Blasphemy in Divinity, together with his stupid Ignorance in Logick.

And of this we have two peremptory Instances as clear as the Meridian Light.

The First is the Animadverter's *Noting this for an absurd and illogical Proposition, to say That God is the Father*, Pref. p. 10.

The Second is *his telling us that the Term* [three intelligent Persons, i. e. the three eternal, infinite, intelligent Persons, of whom the Animadverter speaks before, *Tritheism*, p. 130.] *is adequately and convertibly predicated of* [God.] Pref. p. 11.

First, *To note this for an absurd and illogical Proposition, to say That God is the Father*; what shall Mr. J. B. call it? Shall he call it an Error in Divinity? It is too mild a Name, he cannot but esteem it downright Blasphemy; such blasphemous Stuff that his Modesty cannot but blush to relate it.

That this is so, he makes it very plain, if you please to observe him and can understand him, 1st. from Scripture, 2^{dly} from Logick; and then up again he gets upon the Animadverter and treads upon him.

First, from Scripture. That's very full and decreetory against the Animadverter. *For how often do the sacred Scriptures tell us, that God sent his Son, gave his only begotten Son? Ergo, it is a very plain Case, God is the Father. For he challenges the Animadverter any other ways to expound them than by the Term of the Father, viz. the Father sent his Son, gave his only begotten Son.*

No doubt the Animadverter will so expound them, and so expounded will blush, I believe, as much as Mr. J. B. can, to say the Expressions are absurd and illogical, and will blush again for the University and Church, if he hath any Tenderneſs for them, to see a Man who writes

D

himself

himself A. M. and Presbyter of the Church of *England*, to pretend to dispute in Print concerning the most difficult Point in the World ; and yet, to write at such a loose, ridiculous, childish Rate.

The Animadverter Denies that God is the Father, and Mr. J. B. to confute him effectually from Scripture, and to convict him of Blasphemy, proves from Scripture what 'tis certain he does not deny. All that he pretends to, for what I can see, from Scripture, is, That the Father may be put in Apposition to God. *Does not Scripture, all the Creeds, says he, use the Expression of God the Father?* Yes! And who denies it? Doth not he think, in his Conscience, that the Animadverter uses it himself? Or doth he think that he never says his Creed or his Prayers? And can a Man in the most solemn Manner profess that he believes in God the Father ; and upon his Knees, in the Litany, invoke God the Father. Can such a Man be suppos'd, with any Candour and Charity, to believe the Expression unlawful, absurd and illogical? his Adversary therefore cannot be suppos'd (no, nor by himself) to deny the Passages which he urges out of Scripture, nor what he immediately and directly inferrs from them. To what purpose then doth this Man ask over and over, *Are these Expressions absurd and illogical?* Unless it be to expose his Folly and Impertinence, and to shew that he loves, what no Man of Sense else can, to hear himself talk.

The Animadverter certainly, doth not deny that our Blessed Lord is the Son of God the Father, or that God the Father is as proper and orthodox an Expression, as it is usual : But he denies, That therefore it follows that 'tis proper and Logical to say, that God is the Father. But that, it seems, is plainly for Want of Logick in the Animadverter. For, says Mr. J. B. *had the Animadverter that Skill in Logick, be so often upbraids others with the want of, he would have known that God the Father is equivalent in*
Logick

Logick to this, that God is A Father, and if A Father THE Father. Very profound ! I dare swear the Animadverter doth not understand Logick, as this Man does, nor any Body else that can be said to understand it at all. In what Logick is it, that God the Father is equivalent to this, that God *IS* a Father ? I am apt to think that this Man hath got a Logick of his own, which he keeps lock'd up for his own private Use upon Occasion, and in that perhaps, it may be, but I dare say in no other. Is the Expression, God the Father, a Proposition ? What then, to exclaim in his own Way, *Can there be a Proposition without a Copula ? That is, in other Words, Can there be an Affirmative and nothing Affirm'd ?* If the Animadverter had said any thing like this, what a Noise should we have had about *the Marriage of a Man to himself*, and that without a Copula too ? If God the Father be equivalent in Logick to this, that God *IS* a Father ; then, I hope, Mr. J. B. will allow, that God *is* a Father, is equivalent to God *the* Father ; and if so, God the Father must be a Proposition ; there's no avoiding it : For therefore, a Proposition is said to be equipollent or equivalent, because there's another Proposition to which it is equivalent : And hence it is set down by Logicians, as one of the first things requir'd to denominate a Proposition equipollent or equivalent, *Ut sint (non una, sed) duae pluresve Propositiones, qui dicuntur equipollentes.* And if God the Father be a Proposition, then there must be a Subject and a Predicate, and then the Father is predicated of God, and that's impossible unless we will say God is the Father : And if the Expression be come to that at last, then Mr. J. B. is gone again, for then it will not be equivalent to this, that God is the Father, but identical with it. For that is said to be equivalent, and it cannot be otherwise, which hath the same Sense but not the same Words : But that is said to be identical, which hath the same Words as well as the same Sence.

But not to insist upon this, I will allow Mr. J. B. if he pleases, That it may be inferr'd from this Expression [God the Father] either that God is the Father, or that the Father is God ; which is as much, as in reason he can desire. But now how will Mr. J. B. prove that 'tis the former Proposition which must be inferr'd, and not the latter ; or that both may be inferr'd ? If it must follow from this Expression [God the Father] that God *IS* the Father, that is, That the Father is properly and Logically predicated of God, then it must be upon this Ground ; That whenever one Word is put truly in Apposition to another Word (as here the Word Father is put in Apposition to the Word God) that Word must be truly predicable of the Word to which it is put in Apposition : But this is certainly not so. For a Species may be, and very frequently is, put in Apposition to a Genus, and an individuum to a Species ; yet, I hope, Mr. J. B. will not say, That therefore the Species is to be predicated of the Genus, and the Individuum of the Species. In this Expression, [a Living Creature Man] Man is put in Apposition to a Living Creature, doth it therefore follow, that a Living Creature is a Man ? This would be a very good way to prove a Man to be an Horse. A Master of Arts and Presbyter of the Church of *England*, Mr. J. B. where Mr. J. B. is put in Apposition to a Master of Arts and Presbyter of the Church of *England* : Doth it therefore follow, that this Proposition [A Master of Arts and Presbyter of the Church of *England* is Mr. J. B.] is no absurd, illogical Proposition ? If not, some arch, malicious Sophister or other may prove me to be Mr. J. B. which (whatever Mr. J. B's Preferments may be) I would not be for Twopence : Unless Mr. J. B. by his mighty Skill in Logick, will prove himself not to be the Author of this Preface, and the following Book.

A Thousand Instances of this Nature may be given. But it may be sufficient *to tell this great Critick*, That when one Word is put in Apposition to another, it is sometimes, as Grammarians tell us, *Restringenda Generalitatis gratiâ*, to Restrain and Limit the Signification of that Word to which it is put in Apposition, as *Urbs Roma*, *Animal Equus*: And for this Reason, I doubt not, you'll allow, for this very Reason is the Father in this Expression which Mr. J. B. urges, put in Apposition to God, to restrain the Word God, which is common to all the Three Persons of the ever Blessed, most Admirable Trinity, to the Signification only of the First Person; to signify that God who sent his Son, who gave his only Begotten Son, is not to be understood *enadâc*, but personally, that 'tis God even the Father.

So that 'tis deducible from thence, if he will, That the Father who sent his Son Jesus, who gave his only Begotten Son, is God; as 'tis deducible from our saying the City *Rome*, and the Animal an Horse, that *Rome* is a City, and a Horse is an Animal: But it will no more follow, as I conceive, from our saying [God the Father] that God is the Father, than from our saying the City *Rome*, and the Animal an Horse, that a City is *Rome*, and an Animal is an Horse.

But to give Mr. J. B. further Scope still, allowing him all that he can possibly desire, That from the Expression [God the Father] this Proposition may be inferr'd, God is the Father. How will he prove that the Father, in that Proposition, is the Predicate, and the Term [God] the Subject? For that's the Question betwixt him and the Animadverter. If he will mean no more by it, than that the Father is God: The Animadverter and he are agreed: Which, I doubt, they never will be.

Hath Mr. J. B. so soon forgot, what *he told this great Critick* [the Animadverter] in the beginning of this Page,
That

That tho' the Subject commonly precedes the Verb or Copula, and the Predicate commonly follows, yet this Rule is not Universal? Or shall we find at last that 'tis he himself is the Man, who cannot yet tell when it fails? Truly 'tis somewhat suspicious. For the Particle The, as Mr. Walker hath observ'd in his Treatise of English Particles, answers to the Greek Article δ: And 'tis a Question in Logick, an Articululus Græcus semper notet Propositionis Subiectum? Now though it be not universally true, that the Greek Article doth denote the Subject of a Proposition, yet 'tis generally allow'd, by Logicians and Grammarians, to be a good Rule, to correct the Transposition or Translocation of the Terms, by attending to the prepositive Article; and the Greeks do generally prefix it to the Subject of a Proposition: And where it is otherwise, as sometimes it may be, it is where the Nature of the Term doth forbid it to be a Subject, which, I am sure, the Term [Father] here in the Case before us doth not.

To give an Instance or two of this. How will M. J. B. construe that of *Menander* εἰς ἑνὶ δούλῳ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ δ δεσπότης; will he construe it, *Unus est Servus Domus Dominus?* I know what the Dr. will say to one of your School-Boys that should construe it so. But the true Education a Boy hath under him, will teach him to begin with the last first, with the δ δεσπότης, *The Master is one Servant of the House.* So is that of *Plato* φύσει εὐμενέστερον ζῶον δ φίλῳ, according to the Order the Words lie in, to be render'd, *By Nature an uncertain Creature is a Friend:* Though it is the δ φίλῳ, is unquestionably the Subject of the Proposition.

Mr. J. B. very Soberly and Christianly tells the Animadverter, B. ch. 7. p. 139. *that he is a great Opiniator, who has forgot his Bible behind him, quite forgot Christ and his Twelve Apostles.* Against which virulent, unchristian Charge, I hope, I may be secure, by adding to *Menander* and *Plato* the Authority of the Holy Book of God, which,

I am

I am sure is fully against him in St. *John* 1. 1. where we have the true Divinity of the Holy Jesus thus asserted Θεός ἐν ὁ λόγος. Not to take Notice how some Hereticks have perverted this Proposition (concerning which, *vid.* Bp. *Pearson* on the Creed, *Art.* 2. p. 120.) it is plain, That the Article ὁ prefix'd to the Word λόγος in the Place of the Predicate, denotes notwithstanding the Subject, and accordingly is render'd in our Translation, not according to the Order in which the Words lie, **God was the Word**, but **The Word was God**. So in St. *John*, 4. 24. where we have *God*, put in Apposition to *Spirit* (where the Copula ἐστὶ at least, is not express'd but understood) Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός: Though Πνεῦμα be in the Place of the Subject, yet because it is a Word of a greater Latitude, and the Article ὁ is put before Θεός, therefore is it certainly the Predicate; and accordingly our Translators were wiser than to render it, according to the natural Order of the Words, **a Spirit is God**, but **God is a Spirit**. So that this, I think, may pass for a Demonstration of Mr. *J. B.*'s conceited Ignorance; and that if he had a Thousand Expressions in Scripture where the Father is put in Apposition to God, nay and a Thousand more, in which there was this very Proposition in *Terminis* Θεός ἐστὶ ὁ Πατήρ, it would be so far from proving what he contends for, that the Father is predicated of God, that it would prove the quite contrary, and would unquestionably be Translated, *The Father is God*.

Well, But *God the Father being* (as Mr. *J. B.* says) *equivalent in Logick to this, That God is a Father*, is it not a very plain Case, that the *Animadverter* hath not that Skill in Logick he so often upbraids others with the want of? For otherwise, it seems, he would have known that if God be *A* Father, then he is *THE* Father. *God is A Father, and if A Father, THE Father*. Is not this again very Acute and Admirable? What an *Over-grown, Logical-Noddle*:

Noddle must this Mr. *J. B.* needs have! I dare say, there is not an ordinary Logician to be met with but will think, he might as well have infer'd immediately from the Expression God *the* Father, that God is *the* Father, as that God is *A* Father, without being at the absurd, impertinent Trouble of proving that God is *the* Father, because God is *A* Father.

Pref. p. 5. But this, perhaps, was to show, That though *he can freely acknowledge, that his Genius (his Education or Negligence) never led him to study Criticism in Words, even in his native Language, less in the Learned Languages;* yet his Skill in Particles is very critical and extraordinary; and extraordinary, very extraordinary, indeed it is.

Pref. p. 10. Did you ever hear, Sir, before, or any Man else, that if the Particle *A* is prefix'd to a Word, that therefore the Particle *the* must? After this Rate, Mr. *J. B.* if he pleases, may prove himself to be *the* Writer in this unhappy Controversy about the Trinity, *the* Writer and none else, or *the* Writer καὶ ἑξοχῆς, not excepting *Gilbert* Lord Bishop of *Sarum*, or his *French* Defender. For *A* Writer he must be allow'd to be, such as it is, and if *A* Writer, *the* Writer. Mr. *J. B.* is an A. M. and Presbyter of the Church of *England*, such an one as he is; doth it therefore follow that he is *THE* A. M. and Presbyter of the Church of *England*? God forbid! To prevent this mischievous Consequence, I must tell *this great Critick*, that 'tis a known Rule in Logick, à *Positione Superioris ad Positionem Inferioris non valet Consequentia*. It will follow from the Position of [*The*] to the Position of [*A*] but not *e converso*; that being Distinguishing, Restraining and Definite, this of a greater Latitude and Indefinite. And therefore, though a near Friend of yours be *the* S. Warden of the College, and if *the* S. Warden, no doubt *A* S. Warden, yet, I dare say, the Rest of the Fellows will hardly allow that, because your Friend the S. Warden is *A* Fellow, that he is therefore *the* Fellow. How

How happy was it for that Blessed Martyr, A. Bishop *Laud*, that Mr. *J. B.* was not his Adversary instead of the Jesuite *Fisber*: For in his Conference with the Jesuite [*Confer.* 20.] he allows the Jesuite that the Church of Rome is *A Church*, but not *The Church*. Now if *J. B.* had been to have manag'd the Arch Bishop, he would have confounded him presently in two or three Words from his own Concession, and if *A Church The Church*.

Now pray, Sir, which do you think would weigh down, if, as he would have it, *Pref. p. 5.* *The Animadverter's Criticism in Philosophy and his in Philology were put in the Balance together? But Criticism in Philology*, he confesses, is not his Talent. *His Genius (his Education or Negligence) never led him to it.* But for Philosophy and Divinity have at you! the Animadverter is nothing to him. Though for my part, I am apt to think, That though *J. B.* is A. M. and Presbyter of the Church of England, yet as to these [*Philosophy and Divinity*] he is, what Holy *David* says * of *Men of high Degree, a Lye*: * Psalm 62. 9. And that when he comes to be laid in the Balance for his Philosophy and Divinity by the Animadverter, *he will be found to be deceitful upon the Weights, altogether lighter [than the Animadverter, nay] than Vanity it self.*

One irrefragable Proof of this, amongst the rest, is one of his Scriptural Proofs (which I have not yet taken Notice of) that is to say, [*God is the Father*] is no absurd, illogical Proposition.

St. Paul tells us, says he, *That to us there is one God and Father.* Now whether he means, that St. Paul tells us this (which is most likely) in 1 Cor. 8. 6. where St. Paul tells us, *To us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things*; or that he tells us this in Ephes. 4. 6. (which I shall consider hereafter) where he says that *there is one God and Father of all* (for his Words do not exactly agree with either Place, but seem to be made up of both; and

there is no other Place to which they may be referr'd.) This is most certain, that neither Place doth any more prove what he would have, *viz.* That God is the Father, that is, that the Father, the First Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, may be properly and Logically predicated of God, than he can prove, that *Pontius Pilate* is a Saint (as the poor, ignorant Man thought he was) because he is in the Apostles Creed.

That by the Father here (which he would have to be the Predicate of this Proposition) he means the First Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, there can, I think, be no Dispute. His Design obliges him to mean so. Without it he doth not oppose the Animadverter: And he himself plainly proves that so he doth mean, by what he says before, and by the Text immediately subjoin'd to this, *viz. Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* And he means too, That the Father, who is here predicated of God, is not only the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, the First Person of the Ever-Blessed Trinity, but that he is predicated of God as distinct from the Son and the Holy Ghost. For would he say or mean that the Father in Conjunction with the two other Blessed Persons is predicated of God, no Orthodox Man, no true Worshipper of the most adorable Trinity would oppose him, and the Animadverter so declares himself on his Side [*Tritheism*, p. 230.] but he, contrary to the Sence and Faith of the Holy Catholick Church, of every honest, simple Christian (of which more by and by) declares, *That the Term [Three intelligent Persons] is not adequately and convertibly predicated of God*, that is, That God is not Father, Son and Holy Ghost; and that *the same Expressions of Scripture*, (which prove that the Father is Predicated of God) *confute it.*

Now this being undeniably his Sence of the Term [Father] is it not a most unpardonable Blunder in such an Undertaker

Undertaker as this Man is, to prove, that the Father in his Sence is predicated of God, by a Text of Scripture, where, 'tis most certain, the Term [Father] is taken in quite another Sence? Is this wise Considerer of the Doctrine of the Fathers and the Schools, and pretended Baffler of them both, so wretchedly ignorant, as not to know that the Term [Father] attributed to God, is as Homonymous as the Term [God;] and that the Father is taken, as God is, sometimes ὁποστικῶς, sometimes ἐσιωδῶς;

First, The Word Father, as 'tis taken personally, *ratione ad intra*, in respect of his Son begotten of him from all Eternity, for the First Person only of the Blessed Trinity, begetting from all Eternity a Con-substantial Son; in this Sence, the Father is distinct from the Son and the Holy Ghost.

Secondly, As the Word Father is taken essentially, *ratione ad extra*, in Respect of the whole Creation, for the whole Divine Essence; in this Sence, the Father is not distinct from the Son and the Holy Ghost; in this Sence, the whole Trinity is the Father, the Son is the Father, and the Holy Ghost is the Father: In this Sence is the Word Father sometimes taken both in the Old and New Testament. *Certè constat*, says *Hieron. Zanchius*, *Nomine Patris non semper intelligi in Scripturis Personam Patris, sed totum Deum ipsum Jehovah, Patrem, Filium & Spiritum sanctum. De tribus Elohim*, Par. 2. lib. 5. cap. 5. and in this Sence it is certain is it here taken in 1 Cor. 8. 6. where St. Paul tells us, That to us there is but one God the Father. Let him see *Zanchius*, *loc. citat.* Let him see Bishop *Pearson* on the Creed, *Art. 2. p. 26.* Let him see Dr. *Hammond's* Paraphrase, *Estius in loc.* Let him see whom he will, he will not find, I dare say, so much as one honest Man that will tell Him, that the Father here is taken, as he takes the Word before, Hypostatically, for the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. He might altogether

ther as well, and as effectually, if he had pleas'd, have knock'd down the Animadverter, with the 1st. Verse of the 1st. Chapter of *Genesis*, where *Moses* tells us, *That in the Beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth*. For this indeed is all that the Apostle here tells us, *That to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things*: That is, though to the Heathens there are Gods many and Lords many; yet we Christians are assur'd they are mistaken and are Idolaters; and therefore we acknowledge and believe but one God the Father: *to us there is but one God the Father*, the Father who in the Beginning created the Heaven and the Earth, the Father Almighty (as we profess in our Creed) Maker of Heaven and Earth, of whom, therefore the Apostle adds, *are all things*; *nimirum per Creationem: Non enim Filium intendit Apostolus hâc vice [omnia] comprehendere. Estius in loc.* In this Sence of the Word Father all things are of him by Creation and Conservation, and God is the Father of all things by Creation rather than Procreation, says Bishop *Pearson loc. supr. citat.* and therefore in this Sence our Blessed Saviour, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, cannot be of him and cannot be his Son, unless Mr. *J. B.* will have him to be a Creature, a Factitious, Improper, and Metaphorical God only: And indeed that, I am afraid, will appear at last to be at the Bottom of this Man, and to be the grand Design and ultimate End of his Book, notwithstanding its gaudy, deceitful Title, of which more by and by. I heartily pray to God that it may appear otherwise for his own Soul's Sake, not for any Fear I have that ever he or his Pen will do any great Mischief to the Catholick Faith, with any who will carefully attend him, and have not a Mind to be perverted. But if Mr. *J. B.* means honestly, that the Father, which he would have to be properly and naturally predicated of God, is the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, the First Person of the Ever-Blessed Trinity, distinct

distinct and only hypostatically distinct from God the Son, who is one and the same true God, of one and the same undivided Infinite, Eternal Essence with God the Father, then in this Sence, God the Father, in the Passage he alledges from 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. is not the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, unless he will say, That God is the Father of us and of all other things, in the same Sence, that he is the Father of his only begotten Son our Blessed Lord *Christ Jesus*: And then either he must say, that the Lord *Jesus* is a Creature, a Son only in a borrow'd, Metaphorical Sence by Creation, as we and all things else are, and as he is said to be the Father of the Rain in *Job* 38. 28. or else he must say that God the Father of *whom are all things*, as the Apostle says, is the Father of all things by a proper, Eternal Generation, as 'tis certain he is the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*: And then, which will be the more horrid Blasphemer, the Animadverter or Mr. J. B.?

But if, to avoid this, he will allow it to be plain, as most plain it is, That the Father, in this Passage of *St. Paul*, is certainly not to be taken in the Sence he applies it to, *then* plain it is, That this Mighty Divine betrays his gross Ignorance in a plain Text of Scripture, or, like a mighty pertinent Philosopher, undertakes to prove that God is the Father, in a Sence of the Word in which his Adversary denies it, from a Sence of the Word in which his Adversary and no Body else denies it.

And thus having, I think, made it very evident to any impartial Reader, how loosely this Man argues, or rather how ridiculously he expostulates, instead of arguing, with the Animadverter from Scripture; and how like an unlearned Divine and unstable Christian he wrests *St. Paul's* Words, where they are not hard to be understood by every little Novice in Divinity: Let us next consider, what Reason he hath to swagger and triumph, at the rate he doth, with his *Logicks*, as he calls it,
very

very often in his Book ; and so 'tis more than probable the Critick writ it in his Copy sent to the Press : For we may not well suppose that it should be so very often Printed Logicks, if he had not very often writ it so in his Copy : and therefore I little doubt, but that it was at last put amongst the Errata and alter'd in his Preface by the Advice of some wiser Friend.

Secondly, This terrible Man of Logicks then goes on, and tells us, That *had the Animadverter that Skill in Logick he so often upbraids others with the want of, he would have understood, that if this Proposition be true, The Father is God, it is by the Rules of Logick capable of a Conversion, of putting the Predicate in the place of the Subject, and the Subject in the place of the Predicate, without any Alteration of the Signa Logica [omnis, nullus, aliquis, &c.] where the Subject and the Predicate are both singular, as, says he, I believe them in this Proposition, [the Father is God] and I have the Consent of the Schools on my Side*: That is, If the Animadverter had understood Logick, he would have understood by the Rules of Logick, what by the Rules of Logick he cannot and should not understand, and what is directly contrary to the Rules of Logick.

Had this Logical Braggadochio but a little common Sense, as well as so much Logicks, he would have understood, that in this very place [*Tritheism*, p. 230] where he says the Animadverter is guilty of downright Blasphemy, in noting this for an absurd and illogical Proposition [to say that God is the Father] the Animadverter immediately subjoins his Reason, why according to the Rules of Logick, it must be so ; because, says he, " The Predicate in this Proposition, [*viz.* God is the Father] is " of less Compass than the Subject, which (where it is " not larger) ought to be commensurate to it at least."

Had Mr. J. B. I say, but common Sense, or had he not scandalously wanted that Skill in Logick, which 'tis generally

generally believ'd the Animadverter hath, and which, I doubt not, Mr. J. B. in a short time, will *feel* that he hath, he could not but have seen this to be the Animadverter's Reason why he could not understand that this Proposition [the Father is God] is by the Rules of Logick convertible by a simple Conversion.

For the Learned Animadverter understands well (if Mr. J. B. does not) that a good and true Conversion must contain a good Consequence of the Proposition converting to the Proposition converted: And that it may do so, as the *Conimbricenses* have stated it according to the Sence of all Logicians, it is necessary, as they express it, *Ut Termini non sumantur in unâ latius angustiusve quam in alterâ.*

Logicians are universally agreed that the Subject of a Proposition is always, without any Exception that I know of, a narrower Compass than the Predicate, or at least of an equal, but never of a larger. And is not the Predicate in this Proposition [God is the Father] of less Compass than the Subject? God is unquestionably predicated of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but not so the Father. Father, Son and Holy Ghost are God, is indisputably a true Catholick Proposition; but, I hope Father, Son and Holy Ghost are the Father, is not so. 'Tis the Catholick Faith that the Father is God, the Son is God and the Holy Ghost is God; and each Proposition is infallibly Logical and true: But the Father is not predicated of the Father, but identically; and to predicate him of the Son and of the Holy Ghost (as unquestionably we may God) that is, to say the Son is the Father, as we may say the Son is God; and the Holy Ghost is the Father, as we may say the Holy Ghost is God, is horridly false and damnably Heretical. And can any thing then be plainer, than that the Term [God] is of a larger Compass than the Term [the Father?] And if so, nothing can be plainer, than that this Proposition, the Father is God, cannot by the Rules of Logick, be capable

capable of a simple Conversion, of the Transposition of the Predicate into the place of the Subject, *Salvâ veritate*.

Well, but doth the Animadverter understand what Mr. J. B. believes, *That in this Proposition the Father is God, the Subject and Predicate are both singular; and that he hath the Consent of the Schools on his Side?*

Yes, yes! The Animadverter, no doubt, understands it very well: He understands that God is one or singular, as well as that the Father is one or singular: And therefore he cannot understand three distinct, infinite Minds, or the Orthodoxy of the admirable *Genebrard's* Three Gods, no more than he can understand that there are three distinct Fathers. And the Animadverter understands too, That as Mr. J. B. hath the Consent of the Schools on his Side, that the Father and God are both singular; so the Animadverter hath the same Consent of the Schools on *his* Side; that as the Father is singular *Incommunicably*, so God is singular *Communicably*. The Father is *so Singular* as to be *Incommunicable* to the Son and the Holy Ghost, and can therefore be predicated of neither: God is *so Singular* as to be *Communicable* notwithstanding to Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and can therefore be predicated of all Three *Conjunctly*, and of each of the Three *Distinctly*.

Indeed this is a Communication of one singular, undivided Essence to Three distinct Persons which is most mysterious, peculiar only to the incomprehensible God, cannot be adequately exemplify'd in any thing else, and can never be fully comprehended: But yet so by divine Revelation infallibly it is. And if God be not a *Terminus Communis* to the Three Divine Persons, I would fain know, how the Term God can be predicated of the Son and the Holy Ghost as well as of the Father; I would fain know, how this Man, denying it, can reconcile his Faith with the Athanasian Creed, the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God? Whether by it he doth
not

not bring himself under a more unavoidable Dilemma of denying the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, that the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, than the Animadverter doth by denying that God is the Father, of denying the Divinity of the Father, that the Father is God? And whether lastly it be not an Argument of a *very Peculiar Forehead*, or of some very great Defect within it, for a Man to deny, as this Man does, what is so very plain and obvious, that every Body, of common Sense, who believes the Trinity must needs see it, and see it with that degree of Evidence, as to be as sure of it as that *Homo* is a common Name to all Men.

Let this Man speak out and tell us plainly, whether he doth indeed believe, that the Son is God, and that the Holy Ghost is God as well as that the Father is God. If he doth, let him tell us then how that 'tis possible, if the Name or Term God be not common to all Three.

What this Man offers against this in p. 131. and 132. of his Book, is silly and ridiculous beyond all Comparison; besides what he himself affords, and is alone a Demonstration of the great Unfitness and intolerable Presumption of this Man, to ingage himself on this knotty, sublime Controversy, and to pretend to chastise and ridicule the Animadverter and the Schoolmen at the Rate that he doth.

I shall crave your Patience to examine this Matter very particularly, because he lays so great a Stress upon it.

"The Term [*Deus*] says the Animadverter, is indeed "neither a Genus nor a Species. Nevertheless all Divines and Schoolmen allow it to be a *Terminus Communis*." And I dare say, they do without any Exception, but that of this J. B. and such as deny the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. From hence Mr. J. B. infers, B. p. 131. and finds this great Dictator in Philosophy [the Animadverter] is yet to learn the First Rudiments in Logic. This he finds and upbraids the Animadverter with very often.

F

Now

Now that the Term [*Deus*] is not a *Terminus Communis*, he undertakes to prove 1st. from Logick, in which he seems to me to be as great a Conjurer as I am in Magick; which I can assure you, Sir, I never studied at all. 2^{dly}, from Authority.

1. *First* from his dear Friend Logick. And to shew us that he for his part hath enough of it, and that *HE* is not yet to learn the *First Rudiments in Logick*, as he finds this great Dictator in Philosophy [the Animadverter] is, he tells us, a *Terminus Communis in Logick*, is the same with a *Terminus Universalis*, with a *Terminus Prædicabilis*. This is false. Every *Terminus Universalis* is a *Terminus Communis*, but not *converso*. For what doth he think of an Equivocal Term? *Taurus* is a *Terminus Communis* to a Man, a Beast, a Mountain, and to the second Sign in the Zodiack; but I hope he will not say it is therefore a *Terminus Universalis*, a *Terminus Prædicabilis*. Neither is every *Terminus Prædicabilis* a *Terminus Universalis*. Nay, Three of his Five Predicables [*Differentia*, *proprium*, *accidens*] are not properly Universals. But to let this pass.

All the Logicians, he says, *he hath had the Fortune to consult, speak but of Five Predicables*, Genus, species, Differentia, Proprium, Accidens. Well, and what then? Why then he hath clearly gain'd his Point: Then (the Animadverter not being absurd enough, he thinks, to affirm that the Term *Deus* is either Differentia, Proprium or Accidens, and affirming here expressly, that it is neither a Genus nor a Species) it clearly follows against him, that the Term *Deus* is not a *Terminus Communis*. But if it happen to appear, that it may be and is a *Terminus Communis*, though it be neither a Genus nor a Species, then the Consequence is, That this Man by thus fighting in the dark, hath mis'd the Animadverter, and with one violent Blow hath knock'd down the Platonick Dr. Cudworth for the

he Generical Unity of the Trinity, and for the Specific Unity his Learned and Acute *Petavius*, and his own more Acute and Learned self in to the Bargain.

But what is infinitely worse than all this (and for which he is utterly inexcusable for venturing concerning this tremendous Mystery to play at Blindman's-Buff) in foolishly attempting to make good his Charge of Blasphemy against the Animadverter, he hath blasphemously Ungodded the Son and the Holy Ghost.

For if God be not a *Terminus Communis*, it is impossible it can be predicated of each of the Three Persons of the Ever-Blessed Trinity, either as a Genus or a Species; and so Dr. *Cudworth* and *Petavius* are gone: And if because it is not a *Terminus Communis*, as a Genus or a Species, it therefore can be a *Terminus Communis* no other way, then there's a peremptory End of the Controversy between the Trinitarians and the Unitarians; the Trinitarians must be in the Wrong, and the Unitarians always in the Right. For the Term God cannot be common to Three Persons; and therefore as there can be but one God, so that one God can be but one Person: And therefore, according to this his Doctrine [*Horresco Referens!*] there cannot be God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; that is, God cannot be truly predicated of each Person, for then God would be predicable of more than one, and consequently a *Terminus Communis* to each Person; which, this Man thinks, he hath demonstrated in about half a Score Lines, that it cannot be.

After this, I know there can be no need to say any thing to his Second Argument from Authority: For we may be sure he can have none that is good.

However it is so suitable to his Argument from Logick, so like himself, so fully decretory against the *Conversion* he contends for, and such a clear Justification of my Censure of his Book, the last time I was with you, that I cannot well pass it by.

2. Secondly, Then from Authority he proves it plainly thus; *Not one School-man, or Modern who follow them, do, I verily believe, says he, B. p. 132. allow this Term Deus to be a Terminus Communis.* He quotes not one of these School-men or Moderns; (but *Bellarmin*, in the Margin, who is against him) and I believe, Sir, you can easily guess at one very good Reason at least, why he doth not.

Well, but doth not Mr. J. B. give a Reason why he doth verily believe so? Yes, he doth so: And a very Doughty one it is: As good a Reason almost as any is in his whole Book.

I must repeat his Words that this Matter may be in the clearer Light. *That famous Objection*, says he, *against the Faith of the Trinity, which the School-men and Moderns are so much concern'd to answer, viz. That if the Father is God and the Son is God, the Father must be the Son, grounded upon this Axiom, Quæ sunt eadem uni Tertio, sunt eadem inter se, shews the Judgment of the School-men and Moderns, that they take this Term Deus to be a Terminus Singularis, for that Axiom holds not in a Terminus Communis.*

Now if this Man had studied Seven Years for't, he cou'd not have found out any thing that makes more directly against him; and that shews the Judgment of the School-men and Moderns (quite contrary to what he says) that they take this Term *Deus* to be a *Terminus Communis*; and for this Reason, this very Reason, all the Authors, which my poor Circumstances and Study will allow me, deny that the Axiom holds here.

No Body, but a Tritheist, denies that God is one; that the Divine Essence is one singular, infinite, undivided Essence; and So no Body will deny that God is a *Terminus Singularis*: But as this *Tertium Singulare* [God] to which the Father and the Son agree, is *Communicable* or rather *Common* to Father and Son; So no Body will deny, but

but this *J. B.* that 'tis a *Terminus Communis*: And upon this very Ground it is, that the *School-men and Moderns* are not so much concern'd (as he, like a very suspicious Friend to the Holy Trinity, says they are) to answer this **Famous Objection** against the Faith of the Trinity, but they think it very easily and plainly answered. *Jam licet Essentia Divina sit Singularis, quia tamen Communicabilis est Tribus Personis, ideo NON MIRUM esse illas Personas non esse inter se idem, etsi Essentia idem sint*, says *Stablinus* upon this very Axiom, *Tis. 18. Reg. 2.* Nay, I need fend him no farther than to *Heereboord* upon *Burger/dicius* (which I hope, I may be allow'd to quote as well as he *Dutrieu*, since I am sure I do it much more to the Purpose) *Institut. Logic. lib. 2. c. 8.* where upon this Rule, he will find these Words; *Hac Regula vera est, si illud Tertium Singulare fuerit Incommunicabile; at si fuerit Communicabile, fallit*: And then having propos'd this **Famous Objection** in a Syllogism against the Faith of the Trinity, grounded upon this Rule, he teacheth every little Freshman (that they may not be so much concern'd about it, as it seems the School-men and the Moderns are) thus readily and clearly to answer it; *In hoc Syllogismo vitium est, quod Terminus Medius, scilicet Essentia Divina, sit quidem Tertium Singulare, sed non Incommunicabile; nam Communicatur, aut potius COMMUNIS EST, tribus Personis.*

After this, it can be no wonder (which otherwise it justly might) to see a Passage of *Bellarmin* produc'd by him in the Margin as expressly against him, as he, no doubt, thinks 'tis for him. 'Tis a peculiar way of thinking certainly that this Man hath got; to think that to be for him which every Body else must needs see and think to be against him.

Bellarmin in *Mr. J. B's* Margin tells us, that the Divine Essence, though it be singular, yet because it is truly in pluribus

pluribus suppositis, habet se per modum Termini Communis.

Now if Mr. J. B. doth not design by this to shew that none but such Blockheads as *Bellarmin* and the *Animadverter* will say that the Term [God] is a *Terminus Communis*, then in this Case he takes *Bellarmin* to be his Friend, and inferrs that because the Divine Essence *habet se per modum Termini Communis*, therefore 'tis not a *Terminus Communis*; which is almost as bad as to inferr, *because the Divine Essence is a Terminus Communis, therefore 'tis not a Terminus Communis.* For allowing that *per modum* may sometimes signifie no more than a Similitude, yet 'tis certain here it signifies *specificativè*, by what *Bellarmin* adds afterwards, *quare in Prædicationibus fungitur munere vocis Universalis*; which Office of an Universal Word, it is impossible it can perform unless it be a *Terminus Communis*.

If Mr. J. B. should say that *per modum* here is taken *per modum Similitudinis*; would it not be very ridiculous for any Man to inferr that therefore he says it is not a Similitude, but only the Similitude of a Similitude. I would desire Mr. J. B. to look into *Seibler's* Metaphysics, lib. 1. c. 7. Tit. 6. Art. 2. (a very useful place for him upon other Accounts) where he will find this Phrase used three times within a little Space one of another.

Animal, says he, *per modum Universalis Communicat se Homini*. Will Mr. J. B. or any Man inferr from hence, that therefore *Animal* is not an Universal? And within Four Lines after, he says, That an Universal is predicated of many Species *per modum Generis*: And of many Individuals *per modum Speciei*: And can any thing but prodigious Ignorance, or Perverseness, conclude from hence, that *Seibler* asserts that an Universal which is predicated of many Species is not a Genus; and that an Universal which is predicated of many Individuals is not a Species, because he says one *habet se per modum Generis* and the other *per modum Speciei*?

admirat

This

This indeed, says Mr. J. B. the School-men and Moderns (which by what I have said you may be sure he is intimately well acquainted with) do hold that this Term Deus is a Terminus Singularis Communicabilis, Communicable by Predication, as a Terminus Communis, but in it self a Terminus Singularis. Be it so. This is enough to vindicate the Animadverter's Skill in Logick, and to evince that he may be allow'd to understand Logick and to upbraid justly Mr. J. B. with the want of it, though he doth not understand that if this Proposition be true, The Father is God, it is by the Rules of Logick capable of a Conversion, by which he means, as he afterwards explains himself, a simple Conversion. For if there be no more in it than this which he allows, That the Term God in the Proposition is Communicable by Predication as a Terminus Communis, this is enough to make the Proposition Incapable, by the Rules of Logick, of a simple Conversion; this is enough to evince that such a Conversion is directly contrary to the Rules of Logick. For 'tis an allow'd Rule in Logick, That Simplex Conversio non habet Locum in Propositionibus Singularibus quatenus Pradicatam est Terminus Communis.

Well, but, says Mr. J. B. * *where the Predicate is a* * Pref. p. 11. *Terminus Communis, as the Animadverter contends that God is, there a particular Sign is to be added to the Predicate when it becomes the Subject, as Peter is a Man, some Man is Peter. And upon this, up he gets upon the poor undone Animadverter, and mauls him most wofully with a cruel, unavoidable Dilemma; under which he hath him so fast, that now there's no wagging, no Help for him; but either speak he must with the Scriptures, the Catholick Church, the Schools and Mr. J. B. in saying That God is the Father; or condemn he must All These for absurd and illogical Dunces (not only the Schools and Mr. J. B. but the Catholick Church and the Scriptures must be condemn'd*

condemn'd for absurd and illogical Dunces. A thing certainly never heard of before.) *And declare too he must, that we ought to say, that some particular God is the Father, as some particular Man is Peter.* What shall this miserably hamper'd Animadverter do! Will he deny the Divinity of the Father? I hope not. If not, all the Power of Logick cannot relieve him. I [Mr. J. B.] **Challenge him to avoid one of these Phrases, if he can, by the Rules of Logick; unless he denies the Divinity of the Father, and that,** according to Mr. J. B's Sense (whatever other Philosophers and Divines may hold) is to deny that the Father is God.

Teren. Eunuc.
Act 3. Scen. 1.

*Pulchrè méhercle Dittum & sapienter: Papa!
Jugularas Hominem: Quid illo? Mutus illico.*

What can the Animadverter say to this? Nothing. He must certainly be as mute as a Fish.

Quid ni esset? —————

It is a great Extremity indeed that a Man must be driven to, to be forc'd either to say that which he hath condemn'd for absurd and illogical, or to condemn the **Scriptures** for absurd and illogical Dunces. If the Animadverter had been forc'd only to quit his Assertion, or to condemn some particular Man for an absurd and illogical Dunce, there might have been no great Occasion perhaps for a Figure; but to be forc'd to condemn not only the Catholick Church and the Schools, but the Scriptures too; to condemn **All These for absurd and illogical Dunces**; this is very hard indeed; and he will want such a Figure for the *Phrase*, as I dare say no Author can furnish him with but Mr. J. B.

But I hope it may not be altogether so bad with the Animadverter as Mr. J. B. imagines. If the Animadverter will not quit his Assertion (which I believe, upon good
Terms

Terms he may, and I doubt not but he will) I hope there will be no Necessity of bringing any more than *One* under the aforesaid Condemnation. I hope it may be sufficient with the Scriptures, the Catholick Church and the Schools, to give Glory to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; and to own and acknowledge, that each Person of the Ever-Blessed Trinity is God. And if where the Predicate is a *Terminus Communis*, as the Animadverter contends that God is, there a particular Sign is to be added to the Predicate when it becomes the Subject, as *Peter* is a Man, some Man is *Peter*; and consequently that the Animadverter must be oblig'd by the Rules of Logick, in the Conversion of this Proposition [The Father is God] to say that some particular God is the Father, as some particular Man is *Peter*, if there be no Remedy for this; then let Mr. J. B. first clear the *Platonick and Nicene Hypothesis of the Trinity*, which, as he says, both agreed in this, *That the common Divine Essence was an Universal* [Book p. 104, 105.] that is, let him clear his justify'd Dr. Cudworth, who embrac'd, he says, the *Platonick Hypothesis* that the *Divine Essence* was a *Genus*: Let him clear the *Nicene Fathers* who, he says, held the *Divinity* to be a *Species*: Let him clear all the *Greek Fathers*, who, as he says from *Petavius*, *in hoc Uno Concordant, ὅτι αὐτὸν, id est, Essentiam, five Substantiam, five Naturam, quam ὁῶν vocant GENERALE ESSE aliquid & Commune ac Minimè DEFINITUM*, [Book p. 105.] and p. 106. that 'tis *Commune quiddam multis quod Universale vocant*. Let him clear his trusty, admir'd *Petavius*, who, as he says, like a true Jesuite endeavour'd to impose upon his Reader what he did not believe himself; and in his elaborate Work of the Trinity made only a seeming Defence for the Faith of the Schools, the Singularity of the common Divine Essence, which, upon his Principles, viz. the Authority of the Fathers, was impossible; and therefore, he sham'd the Notion of the Numerical Unity in the Room

of it. This, p. 108. is his own Character of his honest, dear *Petavius* (with whom he makes such a mighty noise throughout his Book) of whose Honesty and Fairness (as Acute and Learned as he was) in this Controversy, let any Man see the Account which the Learned Dr. Bull gives in his *Defens. Fid. Nican. Proem.* p. 7, 8. and then let any honest Man value, or trust *Petavius* afterwards, if he can. *Lastly*, let him clear his own Hypothesis, which he says p. 101. *was the Faith of the Nicene Fathers.* Let him first, I say, clear all these, and then I'll engage to clear the Animadverter, and prove to Mr. J. B's Shame, that if the Animadverter, by only asserting that the Term God is a *Terminus Communis*, but no Genus nor Species, is under any Necessity by the Rules of Logick, either of Denying that the Father is God, or of declaring in a Logical Conversion of the Proposition, That some particular God is the Father, as some particular Man is *Peter*, then All These, (who, as he states their Principles, not only assert the Divine Essence to be Common, but to be an Universal, common either as a Genus or a Species) by the same Rules of Logick, must be under the same, if not a much greater Necessity.

In the mean Time, since this Man is so free of his Challenges, let me beg the Favour of you, if you can possibly do so much for me, to send him my Glove as soon as you can, and to let him know that if he will stand to this, That this Proposition [The Father is God] is capable of a simple Conversion, that is (which is the necessary Consequence of it) that the Term [Father] is adequately and convertibly predicated of God: And if upon this, he will stand to his Arms in the next Paragraph, by which he thinks he hath given the Animadverter a most Fatal and Irrecoverable Overthrow, *viz. That whatever is adequately and convertibly predicated of any Term, may in all Propositions be put in the place of that Term;* if he will stand to this, I
 Challenge

Challenge him to avoid, if he can, by his own Rules of Logick, these absurd and intolerably unchristian Consequences, *viz.* That according to this Rule, we may say that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one Father. In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was the Father. And (which too will justifie the Patripassian Heresie) without Controversy, great is the Mystery of Godliness, *the Father was manifest in the Flesh, justified in the Spirit, &c.* I Believe in one Lord *Jesus Christ*, Father of Father, very Father of very Father. And if it follows from the Expression [God the Father] that God is the Father; then it will follow from these Expressions [God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost] that God is the Son, and God is the Holy Ghost; and then too according to this Rule, we may say that the Father is the Son, and the Father is the Holy Ghost.

I should not dare, Sir, you may be sure, to send such a bold Challenge to such a desperate Heroe, who so easily routs the Animadverter, baffles St. *Augustin*, and, except honest, stout *Petavius*, and the invincible *Genebrard*, makes all the School-men, and the Moderns too, to shrink and fly before him in their dark and slippery way, as if the Angel of the Lord drove them: But never fear your Friend for this, I am very sure in this I shall be too hard for him. This, to brave him once with his own Words, *Pref. p. 2.* *This will still stand unanswer'd, and upon Mr. J. B's Principles is, I am satisfy'd, Unanswerable.*

And now to conclude this Point with his own Gird upon the Animadverter [Book p. 54.] (which, however applicable it may be to the Animadverter, every Body certainly will allow that it is most justly and appositely so to himself.) *There is not a surer Sign, that an Author does not understand the Subject he writes upon, than his bringing an Objection which is so plainly and easily retorted upon his own Hypothesis.* And such an Objection is this which I am next to consider, and is the third thing advanc'd by Mr. J. B.

against the Animadverter, and is urg'd as another Instance of the Animadverter's Absurdity, Heterodoxy, and Blasphemy in Divinity; but is a bright Evidence that he himself is scandalously Guilty of what he charges the Animadverter with, and that he is altogether unfit to be trusted with the Management of such an intricate, sublime Controversy, so much above his Learning and Parts.

3. *The same Expressions of Scripture*, says Mr. J. B. *confute what the Animadverter tells us, that the Term [Three intelligent Persons] is adequately and convertibly predicated of God.*

Now in speaking to this, I shall first assert the Truth of what the Animadverter tells us. And secondly, I shall weigh Mr. J. B.'s Objection against it. Weigh it did I say! 'Tis too great a Solæcism. I shall shew it to have no Weight at all, but to be ridiculously absurd and prodigiously ignorant.

First, I shall assert the Truth of what the Animadverter tells us, that the Term [Three intelligent Persons] is adequately and convertibly predicated of [God]; that is, that as 'tis true, That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are God, so 'tis as true, proper and Logical to say, That God is the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

I cannot pretend to any great Skill in the Fathers and Councils. I must own I am as little acquainted with them, as I believe Mr. J. B. is. I have 'em not, and you know, Sir, that my Circumstances are such as will not allow me to buy many Books; and that I may truly complain in the Words of the Admirable Dr. Bull in the Preface to his *Defens. Fid. Nic.* (with the Alteration only of one Word) *Nec potui ipse, Homo tenui censu & Liberis Aufus, Librorum sumptum sustinere.*

However, I hope, there may be no great Occasion for Fathers and Councils in so plain a Case as I take this to be, which the Animadverter tells us, and particularly insists upon

upon against the Dean [*Trisheism*, p. 230.] and that I may safely assert it to be the Catholick Faith. *Peter Lombard* I have, who, I think, I may be very sure, understood the Catholick Faith much better than Mr. *J. B.* doth, or I am afraid ever will: And he not only very fully and expressly condemns this bold Man as an *Adversary* to the Truth, but in *Terminis* asserts what the *Animadverter* tells us, to be the Catholick Faith.

His Words are these [*Lib. 1. Distinct. 4. Lit. c.*]
 “ *Quidam tamen VERITATIS ADVERSARIJ, concedunt Patrem & Filium & Spiritum sanctum, sive tres Personas esse Unum Deum, Unam Substantiam: sed tamen Nolunt Concedere, Unum Deum sive Unam Substantiam esse Tres Personas: Dicentes Divinam Substantiam Prædicari de Tribus Personis, non Tres Personas de Substantia Divina. FIDES autem CATHOLICA TENET AC PRÆDICAT, & Tres Personas esse Unum Deum & Unam Substantiam sive Essentiam, sive Naturam Divinam: & UNUM DEUM sive ESSENTIAM Divinam esse TRES PERSONAS.*”

After this, to confirm what he says, he produces several Passages out of several Places of *St. Augustin*, who fully asserts the same.

Thus that Learned Lutheran *Cunradus Dietericus* in his *Institut. Catechet. de Symbol. Apostol.* to this Question, *Quis igitur est Deus in Essentia sua?* Answers, *Est Deus Pater, Filius & Spiritus sanctus.* And a little after in the Explication of this Answer hath these Words, *Essentia nihil aliud est, quam ille Tres Persona Pater, Filius & Spiritus sanctus simul junctæ; & Personæ nihil aliud sunt quam illa ipsa Essentia Divina.* So *Ursin*, *Explicat. Catechet. Par. 2. sub Quæst. 25.* So *Zanchius*, *de tribus Elohim Par. 2. Lib. 1. c. 3. p. 385, 387.* So our Holy Mother the Church of *England* (to the Scandal of which therefore he writes himself Presbyter of it) in the Holy Communion

munion Service in the proper Preface for Trinity-Sunday obliges us in the most solemn Manner, as we are about to take the most Blessed Sacrament of our Dear Saviour's most Precious Body and Blood, to own and declare, That the God, the One God, whom we worship is Three Persons. Nay, (which one that hath not read his Book would hardly believe) so he himself tells us expressly, That 'tis the *Common Article of the Christian Faith, That God is Three Persons* [Book p. 84.] And what an intolerable Piece of Presumption then must it needs be in this Malapert Man, to assert that the *same Expressions of Scripture confute what the Animadverter tells us*, and what he himself tells us is the *Common Article of the Christian Faith*? Presumption did I call it! It is too mild a Name, I esteem it a downright Blasphemy. What! Do the Expressions of Scripture confute the Catholick Faith? Do the Expressions of Scripture confute the great and most glorious Mystery of our Religion, the Doctrine of the Unity in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; which (as we profess in the Athanasian Creed) except a Man believe faithfully he cannot be sav'd? God deliver us from such ignorant, or false, treacherous Defenders of the Holy Trinity!

If we who believe the Trinity in Unity, are oblig'd to believe the Three Divine Persons to be One God, why are we not as well oblig'd to believe One God to be Three Persons, who believe the Unity in Trinity? I have shewn Mr. J.B. why by the Rules of Logick, the Father cannot be predicated of God, because the Predicate must not by the Rules of Logick, be of less Compass than the Subject. Let him shew me, if he can, That the same Objection, or any other lies against the Three Divine Persons, being predicated of God: And if he cannot (and that I am pretty sure of) then *the Scriptures*, I hope, *do not confute what the Animadverter tells us*; then (whatever becomes of what Mr. J.B. tells us) what the Animadverter here tells

us,

us, stands fast; and I shall ever, I hope, believe it, as, I thank God, I always have, not only to be true, but to be the Catholick Faith. For,

Secondly, The Reason which he offers against it, which is the Second Thing to be consider'd is, as I said before, and shall now prove, ridiculously absurd and prodigiously ignorant.

His Reason is this, *viz.* *For whatever is adequately and convertibly predicated of any Term, may in all Propositions be put in the place of that Term.* This cannot possibly serve for any thing but a Rod for his own Breech (which I have made bold to lash him with before) and expose him to the Pity of his Friends, the just Censure of every judicious Reader, and the just Scorn and Contempt of his Learned Adversary.

How he will avoid the grievous Difficulties he brings himself under by this Rule, let him look to't. But that according to this Rule we may say, as he inferrs from what the Animadverter tells us, *That Three intelligent Persons sent his Son, gave his only Begotten Son, that our Saviour is the Son of Three intelligent Persons. Blessed be Three intelligent Persons, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* This is such a gross, wretched Blunder, that, as he truly says (not considering at all what he says) *there needs no Words to expose or confute these Expositions.* No certainly! There needs none for any Body but himself.

And is it not great Pity, Sir, and a Scandal to our Universities and Church, that there should be such an A. M. and Presbyter of the Church of England as J. B. who wants to be told, That Three Divine Persons are not One Divine Person, and that One Divine Person is not the Three Divine Persons? That the Persons Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are not the Person of the Father, and that the Person of the Father is not the Persons of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? What a strange Stupor is this, that this Man labours

labours under ! And yet must needs be writing of Books, and Books of the Blessed Trinity too. Is it possible for any Man to be so blind, so very hebetious, as not to see plainly, that the Term [God] of which the Animadverter says the Term [Three intelligent Persons is adequately and convertibly predicated] is not taken personally for God the Father ? It is impossible it should be so taken, unless we can suppose that the Animadverter's Assertion is, That the Three intelligent Persons are adequately and convertibly predicated of God the Father, the First Person of the Blessed Trinity. If not, if the Term [God] be not taken by the Animadverter personally for God the Father, but *Essentially* for God as Common to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as most evidently it is, then allowing this Rule ; that whatever is adequately and convertibly predicated of any Term, may in all Propositions be put in the Place of that Term, how could any thing but the most stupid Ignorance infer from hence, that *according to this Rule we may say, That Three intelligent Persons, sent his Son, gave his only begotten Son, &c.* when nothing can be more manifest that Three intelligent Persons are not here, in any of the Instances he gives, put in the place of that Term [God] as 'tis taken by the Animadverter Essentially and Indefinitely, as the Term God, that is, is common to all the Three Divine Persons, and is truly predicated of them *simul sumptis* : But they are put by him in the place of the Term [God] in a Sence in which it is most certain the Animadverter doth not mean it, that is, as God is taken definitely and personally for God the Father. For God who sent his Son, gave his Son, and is the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, is not God, I hope, as the Term signifies the whole Trinity, all the Three Divine Persons, but as it signifies personally, the First Person of the Blessed Trinity, God the Father distinct from God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost : And therefore it is most manifest, That
it

it can no more follow, according to this Rule, from what the Animadverter tells us, that we may say, That Three intelligent Persons sent his Son, &c. than it can follow, that because Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are God, therefore they are God the Father.

The oftner I read these Words (as he expresses himself against the Animadverter [Book p. 153.] and nothing can be more proper and suitable than to rebuke him with his own uncircumcis'd Lips) the more I admire at the presumptuous Confidence of him that wrote them. I am sure no Man can give a more convincing Argument of his utter unacquaintance with the Principles of all Philosophy and Divinity.

This indeed is a Demonstration to me, That this Mr. J. B. either wants common Sense, or common Honesty; or that he is utterly ignorant of the well-known Homonymy of the Term [God] that in its proper Acceptation, it is sometimes taken absolutely, indefinitely, or (as some express it) simply and (as the School-men generally express it) essentially. In this Sense it is taken for the Divine Essence, which is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; or, as Zanchius expresses it [*De tribus Elohim, Par. 1. Lib. 6. cap. 1. p. 259.*] "*Pro toto, ut ita loquar, Deo, proq; Divina Essentia, seu pro Deitate, quæ nihil est aliud, quam Deus ipse totus, Pater, Filius, Spiritus sanctus.*" And in this Sense, it is manifest, the Animadverter takes the Term [God] in what he tells us. Sometimes again the Term [God] is taken definitely, distinctly, or (as some express it) *Secundum Quid*, (or as the School-men generally speak) personally. In which Sense, it is taken when it is predicated only of some certain Person of the Trinity, sometimes of the Person of the Father only, sometimes of the Son only, and sometimes of the Holy Ghost only, in which distinct, personal Sense it is manifest that God is to be taken in the Expressions of Scripture, which he here alleges, when it is said God sent his Son, gave his only
H begotten

begotten Son, &c. that is, God the Father, as he himself before determines: And in this Sense, it is as manifest that the Animadverter doth not take it, in what he here tells us.

So that this Man must say, either that he well knew in his Conscience that this which he urges here against the Animadverter is a *Non sequitur*, a mere *Sophisma Plonymia*, and that he intended only in Imitation of his Father *Petru*, * to *sham* his Brother, to put a pitiful, little Trick upon him, which is not well consistent with common Honesty; or else I must say that he is scandalously ignorant: And so like those conceited Gnosticks St. Paul speaks of, who prided themselves in their great Knowledge above that of other Men, and suppos'd all other ignorant but themselves, *If this Man vainly thinketh he knoweth any thing, I have too much reason to tell him, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know, 1 Cor. 8. 2.* And yet the Homonymy of the Term [God] (which there is hardly, I think, any little Novice in Divinity, that is not less than himself, but knows) is, to use his own Words, *Pref. p. 3. a very necessary Matter to be known by all who pretend to give us an Hypothesis to solve the sacred Mystery of the Trinity [to do otherwise is (if any thing be) to make a Key for a Lock by the Key-hole only: Such a Key is a mere Shew, 'tis Ten Thousand to One, that it never fits the Wards.]*

In this very Paragraph, *Pref. p. 3.* from whence I borrow these Words for him, it may be worth your while, Sir, a little to observe this *Thrase* (that you may the better know the Man) strutting like a Crow in a Gutter, or like a Cock-Turkey letting down his Wings and raising his Plumes to make himself as big again as really he is, thus displaying his intolerable Vain-Glory.

I [Mr. J. B.] I Discuss that Important and Fundamental Enquiry in this Mystery, viz. *What is it which determines the*

* Book p. 108.

Vid. Dr. Hammond's Paraph. in Loc.

the Singularity or Plurality of the Predication of any Attribute concerning the Divine Persons: Where I [Mr. J. B. by himself] first give the Predications themselves which are to be solv'd. A very necessary Matter, &c. ut supr. Secondly, I Consider the Answers of the Schools and shew their Insufficiency. Lastly, I endeavour to give the true Solution **My Self**: Besides Six great Things which I doth before, and a great many strange Exploits which I doth after.

And now to serve him again with his own Words [Book p. 139.] (for which I must confess I am often mightily beholden to him, they are so very pat for him) Make Room for this mighty Man, keep Silence, and learn from him, what the ignorant *Animadverter*, the trifling St. *Augustin*, the impertinent School-men, and the silly, sortish, Moderns, their Followers, could never teach you before.

Polo deripere Lannam vocibus possum meis:

So, as *Horace* hath it somewhere in his Epistles, the Witch *Canidia* boasts. But they were but Words I throw. Just such vain, impotent Braggs as Mr. J. B's are. He do those things, he so vauntingly talks of! So could the Hag *Canidia* with her conjuring Words, snatch the Moon from her Pole: So could *Quintus Serenus* cure an Ague with his proud, cramp Word ABRACADABRA.

After all, I am afraid, as I hinted before, that there is some lurking Evil, some sly Design in this Book, which some may not be aware of. I am afraid, that besides the many Follies, Impertinencies, Mistakes, Absurdities and Contradictions with which his Book abounds, we have a Lap-full of wild Gourds, and that there is Death in the Pot *. For he seems to me not only to do what he can to puzzle the Cause, and slyly to undermine the Catholick Faith of the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity; but he plainly betrays it, and roundly gives it up

* 2 Kings, 4-39, 40.

to those abominable Hereticks whom he pretends to oppose.

That this he doth, I shall undertake now to make out very fully and plainly, and is the last thing I shall trouble you with about him.

In the Preface here, p. 10, 11. he undertakes to prove by Scripture and by Logick, That God is the Father, that 'tis Blasphemy to deny it: That if this Proposition be true, [the Father is God] it is by the Rules of Logick capable of such a Conversion, as that 'tis as true to say, that God is the Father as that the Father is God; that is, That One Person is adequately and convertibly predicated of God, that is, by necessary Consequence, that God is One Person: And that he is *But* One Person, and that there's no such thing as this Trinity of Divine Persons, according to the Sense of the School-men and Moderns, and the Holy Catholick Church, and our Holy Mother the Church of *England*, he tells that the Term [God] is a singular Predicate; that it is not a *Terminus Communis*, as foolish Christians do generally believe it; that is, That God is not common to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but adequately and convertibly predicated of the Father only: And therefore, very consequently to this he tells us very roundly, that 'tis false, and the Expressions of Scripture confute it, to say that the Term [Three intelligent Persons] is adequately and convertibly predicated of God; for that would be utterly inconsistent with, and contradictory to the Fathers, being adequately and convertibly predicated of the same God, that is, 'tis false, and the *Expressions of Scripture confute it*, to say, That the One Holy and Eternal God whom we Worship is Three intelligent Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Let him clear himself and prove, if he can, that I do not expound him, honestly, justly, and fairly. If I do not it is very unwittingly and unwillingly, God knows.

And

And is not this Man then a choice Considerer of the Doctrine of the Fathers, and the Schools concerning the Trinity? Is not this an admirable Champion of the Holy Catholick Faith? A precious Defender of the Reverend Dean of *St. Paul's*? I hope the Reverend Dean did not give any thing for him, or fetch him far. If he did I am sure he hath bought him very dear. But I hope (and I cannot but believe it) that though this Book was Printed for the Dean's Bookseller, the Dean knew nothing of it, at least did not peruse it till 'twas Printed.

It is very plain, I think, That this Man, under a Pretence of defending the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, doth either ignorantly or treacherously expose and betray it. It is very plain, here in his Preface, that his Doctrine is, that God is the Father, and is not Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that is, That God is one Person and is not Three Persons; and therefore this must be allow'd as a very proper, suitable Preface to his Book, in which he makes it yet plainer, if it be possible, that this is his Doctrine, and gives it us as his Creed [*ch. 4. n. 18. p. 84.*] in this Form; *I Believe that the God whom the Heathen Philosophers by the Light of Nature worshipped was One Divine Person. I Believe that the same One Divine Person spake of himself in these sacred Words of the Law, I am the Lord thy God, &c. I also Believe, That this One Divine Person was the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

This is his Confession of Faith (which we shall have by and by delivered in another Explanatory Symbol) and I'll engage that there is not a Man upon the Earth, who believes that there is but One true God; and that there was such a Person upon Earth as *Jesus Christ*, let him be Jew, Gentile, Arian, Sabellian, Socinian, what he will but will freely join with him in it and subscribe to it. Agreeably to this Faith, he thinks fit to *Curry* a little and Declare [*B. p. 100.*] that he is not for Persecution, no, not of the Socinians.

'Tis

* Psalm 80.
12, 13.

* Cant. 2. 15.

'Tis very strange if he should. I'll warrant him a notable, swinging Latitudinarian. I am not my self for Persecution in the true Sense of the Word; but yet I am not for setting aside the penal Laws and Test: I am for keeping up the Hedges of our Vineyard (if the good God so please) that all they that go by, may not pluck off her Grapes; that the wild Boar out of the Wood may not root it up, and the wild Beasts of the Field devour it *. And I am clearly, instead of trusting them and letting them in by any false, treacherous Comprehension, for taking the Foxes, the little Foxes that spoil the Vines *. And I heartily thank God for't, there is yet a great Body of honest, learned, good Men, who value the Honour and Good of the Church of *England* above all politrick, worldly Considerations whatsoever, of my Opinion.

But to return to this Comprehension-Man's Comprehensive Creed, which will give as great a Liberty of Conscience, if not a greater, as ever the late King *James* aim'd at in his Declaration, (whereby to do *HIS* Business in one Sense, and *OURS* in another) and will comprehend as many as the licentious Author of a late Letter for Toleration can possibly desire,) though he doth Believe that the God whom the Heathen Philosophers by the Light of Nature worshipped, was One Divine Person: And though he doth Believe that the same One Divine Person spake of himself, that is (I suppose you will allow me he means) of himself as One Divine Person: And though he doth Believe that this One Divine Person was the Father, &c. yet he tells you there, he doth most firmly believe, that the Faith of a Trinity of Divine Persons and the Article of the Unity of God [As it was Believ'd by the wisest of the Heathens and the Jewish Church] [who Believ'd God to be but One Divine Person] are by no means inconsistent. Nor does this contradict that common Article of the Christian Faith, viz. That God is Three Persons, as the Socinians vainly pretend, and some

some others unwarily grant them. Good God! What strange Delusions are some Men given over unto, that they should believe a Lye! 'Tis very true what Mr. J. B. says [Book p. 158.] *That some Persons take a Privilege to speak and write what they please: And certainly never any Man made more Use of this Privilege than himself.*

2 Theſ. 2. 11.

Do the Socinians vainly pretend, that it is a Contradiction for One and the same God to be but One Person, and yet to be Three Persons? If it be not a Contradiction, I do averr that nothing can be so. *Some*, he says, *do unwarily grant the Socinian that it is a Contradiction*; as if some others or rather the most do not. What a vile Reflection is this upon the Orthodox, nay upon Mankind! Let him name me a Christian, or a Man besides himself that will say that [One Person is Three Persons] is no Contradiction. We have been ever able, and ever shall, to defend the Catholick Faith, That One and the same God is Three Persons, from being a Contradiction; and therefore, though it be a great and incomprehensible Mystery, yet we most firmly believe it as clearly revealed to us in Scripture, according to the constant Interpretation given of it by the Holy Catholick Church down to these Days: But to say that One and the same Person is Three Persons, is to say that One and the same is not One and the same; and that Three Persons are not Three Persons but One Person, and is therefore such a Contradiction as is impossible to be revealed by God, that cannot lye, and impossible to be defended. Let Mr. J. B. if he pleases, try what he can do.

Now if One and the same God, who *was* and is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the same One God whom the Heathen Philosophers and the Jews worshipped (as no doubt he is;) and if this One God *was* One Divine Person (which, no doubt, he was not, though believed and worshipped by them but as One Person, and that without Heresie, God having not made so full a Revelation of himself

self

self under that Oeconomy as under the Christian) and if Mr. J. B. doth most firmly believe, as he saith he doth, that the Faith of a Trinity of Divine Persons, and the Article of the Unity of God, *AS* it was believ'd by the wisest of the Heathens and the Jewish Church (who believ'd the One God to be *but* One Divine Person) *are by no means inconsistent*; then either he must say that the same God, who *was* but One Divine Person is now, since Christianity, become Three Divine Persons, which is utterly inconsistent with his immutable Nature; or that the same One Divine Person was and is Three Divine Persons, which is a Contradiction; or lastly, that *that one Divine Person whom the Heathens and Jews worshipped, was and is the One only true God*; And as for the other Two Divine Persons, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, which with that One Divine Person which the Heathens and Jews worshipped, and who is the *One only true God*, make up a Trinity of Divine Persons; the Term God may indeed be predicated of them, but not strictly, properly and truly, as it is of God the Father. For though there be a Trinity of Persons call'd Divine, yet 'tis God the Father *whom the Heathens and Jews worshipped is the One only True God*: and *SO the Faith of a Trinity of Divine Persons and the Article of the Unity of God [as it was believed by the wisest of the Heathens and the Jewish Church] are by no means inconsistent*: And so perhaps honest Ginebrard's Three Gods and the Quasi-Specifical Unity is made out in to the Bargain. For, tho', as Mr. J. B. saith [ch. 4. n. 19. p. 85.] *The Reverend Dean never asserted that the Son or Holy Ghost could not be properly call'd the One God, or only True God*; yet he [his noble Defender] dares to do what the Dean durst not: he can and will assert it. *I, saith he, p. 86. do assure him [the Animadverter] that I am neither afraid of him, nor the Socinians; I crave no Favour at either of their Hands for This Profession of my Faith, that the Title of One God,*

God, only True God, is a proper, personal Prerogative of the Father Alone. Now 'tis out.

Now you see clearly why he will have the Term God, in the Preface, to be adequately and convertibly predicated of the Father, and will not allow it [the Scriptures, he saith, confute it] to be adequately and convertibly predicated of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Certainly, whatever Occasion this Man may have to be *Afraid* of the Animadverter, he can have none at all to be *Afraid* of the Socinians, unless it be as the Psalmist says, That they should laugh him to Scorn *, for pretending to be their Adversary: For such a Trinity as this is, it is certain the Socinians, who are the Followers of *Bidle*, do believe and contend for.

* Psalm 80. 6.

If the Title of *One God, only True God*, be appropriated and peculiar only to the Person of the Father, a proper, personal Prerogative of the Father Alone; then let any Man prove, if he can, That the Son or the Holy Ghost is properly God, unless he can prove that there be more Gods than one.

Let Mr. J. B. with all his Logicks and vast Stock of Reason prove, if he can, That this *Profession of his Faith* is not by his own Confession, worse than Socinian, worse than *Nine Parts in Ten of the Objections of the Socinians*, which, saith he, [Book p. 173.] are not levell'd against the Fundamental Truth of this Article, the true Divinity of each single Person [of the Blessed Trinity.] If, as he says, he plainly sees that *Nine Parts in Ten of the Objections of the Socinians* are not levell'd against this Fundamental Truth, he might, one would think, if he had not wink'd hard, have seen as plainly that this Profession of his Faith is directly levell'd against it.

For is it not most ridiculously absurd, a monstrous Contradiction, to assert the true Divinity of each single Person of the Blessed Trinity, and yet to deny that the Son, or the Holy Ghost may be call'd True God? But if it be proper

per and peculiar to the Father *alone*, to be the One God, the only True God, it is demonstrable that neither the Son nor the Holy Ghost can be so: Unless the Father *Alone* can be the One God and not the One God, the *only* True God and not the *only* True God. And therefore I'll be bold to challenge this mighty Challenger to clear, if he can, *this Profession of his Faith* from being a monstrous Contradiction, or a monstrous Heresie.

It will nothing avail him to say, That 'tis the Title of One God, *only* True God which he asserts to be the proper, personal Prerogative of the Father *Alone*. For if the Father *alone* be not *Revera* the One God, the *only* True God, it cannot be the *proper, personal Prerogative of the Father alone* to be so call'd, unless we will lye for the Father, and say that he *alone* is what *alone* he is not. What is proper and personal, in Divinity and common Sense, is incommunicable; and therefore if to be One God, *only* True God be the *proper* and personal Title of the Father *alone*, the Father *alone* must enjoy it: Neither Son nor Holy Ghost can have it; nor can it be predicated of the whole Trinity, unless the Father *alone* is the whole Trinity.

It is plain therefore, if any thing by Words can be so, That this Man according to this his publick Profession of Faith, doth deny the Catholick Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, which he falsely and insidiously, or ignorantly, by the gaudy, pompous Title of his Book, pretends to defend. For he denies the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be *One God, the only True God*. For if they [the Three Divine Persons] be truly and properly *One God, the only True God*, no Man living, I suppose, will deny but that they may *truly and properly* be so call'd. And he denies the *true* Divinity of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. For if the Father *alone* be One God, *only* True God; how can the Son be God and the Holy Ghost be God, *but improperly and metaphorically*? True God (according to this Man's

Man's Principles) neither of them can be; for the *only True God* is the Father *alone*.

This is this Mans Faith, according to the defying publick Profession which he here makes of it.

And to make himself the more blasphemous, more abominable, and inexcusable, he quotes and brings in with unparallell'd Ignorance and Confidence, 1st. The Nicene Council. 2^{dly}, All the Oriental Fathers. 3^{dly}, Our Blessed Saviour. 4^{thly}, St. Hilary, and 5^{thly}, St. Paul, to abett, and patronize him in it. [Book p. 85.]

1. First, As for the Nicene Council, which, he says, appropriates this Title to the Father: What can be more false and imposing? "*Credimus in Unum Deum, Patrem Omnipotentem, & Unigenitum Filium ejus Jesum Christum, & Spiritum sanctum. Non Tres Deos, sed Patrem, Filium & Spiritum sanctum Unum Deum colimus & confitemur. Non sic Unum Deum, quasi Solitarium,*" &c. Lamb. Danaei Expos. Symb. Apost. ex Patrib. Orthodox. Art. 1. p. 6, 7. where he may find Authorities enough, out of the Fathers, against him.

"*Credo in Deum. Nomen Dei hic sumitur essentialiter pro Deo Patre, Filio & Spiritu sancto: Quia verbum [Credo] cum Particula [in] refertur eodem modo ad omnes Tres Personas Deitatis.*" Ursin. in Explicat. Catechet. Par. 2. Quæst. 26.

He will not deny, I believe, that the Term [God] in the Apostles Creed is taken in the same Sense with that in the Nicene; for that Bishop Pearson upon the Creed has observ'd, Art. 1. p. 23. "That this Creed in the Churches of the East, before the Council of Nice, had that Addition in it [I believe in One God] that is, says Dr. Comber, *I confess with my Mouth, That I believe in my Heart in One God, a pure and infinite Spirit, distinguished into Three Persons, the First of which is God the Father, &c. Compan. to the Temple, Part 3d. S. 5.*

And therefore says *Zanchy*, most fully and expressly against what this Man asserts; to prove from the Creed that 'tis the Father alone who is the One God, is a mere *Fallacia Compositionis*, which the Hereticks make use of to prove their and this Man's Faith from the Creed, "*Quam scilicet conjungunt in oratione qua sunt distinguenda; ut verbi gratia, quum probant, ideo Solum Patrem esse Deum verum quia in Symbolo legimus, Credo in Unum Deum Patrem. Hic enim conjungunt Nomen Patris cum Nomine Dei, nullamq; interponunt distinctionem inter Dei & Patris Nomen, cum tamen distincte ita legendum esse videtur, ut primo dicatur in genere, Credo in Deum; postea vero per Personas, quasi per partes explicetur, quis sit iste Deus, nempe Pater, Filius & Spiritus sanctus. Hi enim Tres Elohim sunt seu partes non totales sed essentielles. τὸ Ἰησοῦν.*" *Hieron. Zanch. de Tribus Elohim, Par. 2. c. 2. p. 383.*

I am almost confident that this intolerably bold Man, cannot produce so much as one Author who so interprets the Beginning of the Nicene Creed, that the Title of One God is appropriated to the Father, in Opposition to the Son and the Holy Ghost. And as the One God is not appropriated in that Creed to the Father, but refers to all the Three Persons, so neither is the Title of *only True God*: But this very Creed which this frontless Man quotes for him, is expressly full and dectory against him; and not only calls the Second Person [the Son] God of God, but *very God of very God*, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινῆ, *Deum verum de Deo vero*, True God of True God. And is it not very likely now, that all the Oriental Fathers, and our Blessed Saviour should determine for him against the express Words of the Nicene Creed?

Secondly, As for *All the Oriental Fathers* [every one of them, no doubt, he hath read and understands throughly well] we must take his Word that what they say in the Nicene Creed, they do *not* say nor believe. These are some of the Fruits of *Hasty Births*.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, As for our Blessed Saviour, he saith indeed, St. John 17. 3. *This is Life eternal that they might know thee the only True God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* But doth it follow from hence, that our Saviour appropriates this Title of *only True God* to the Person of the Father? Never any Body that I can find made such an Inference but the worst of Hereticks, and with them indeed nothing is more frequent. He cannot, I dare say, name me one Heretick Author who denies the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, but what urges these Words of our Saviour to prove the very thing he contends for. "*Parologismus Secundus, isque Frequentissimus, says Zanchy* [de Tribus Elohim, par. 2. c. 2. p. 382, 383.] *est ἀμυβολία, quum scilicet argumentantur ex Scripturarum locis qui multiplicem possunt habere sensum: Ipsi vero Heretici illum arripiunt, qui neq; cum aliis Scripturis neq; cum analogia Fidei est consentaneus. Ut, verbi gratia, quum probant Solum Patrem ideo esse Illum Unum Deum, &c. quia dixit Christus, hæc est vita æterna, ut cognoscant te solum verum Deum & quem misisti Jesum Christum, Jo. 17. 3. Now that what the Hereticks and Mr. J. B. contend for, doth not follow*

from hence, he thus goes on clearly to evince; *Ἀμυβολία est in his verbis, Potest enim illud [τὸν μόνον] &c. I shall translate his following Words exactly into English*.* "That Word [only] may be referred to the Subject, that is, to the Father; so as that the Sense may be *the Father only is the True God*: Or to the Predicate, so as that the Sense may be, *the Father is*

* Potest enim illud [τὸν μόνον] referri ad Subjectum, id est, ad Patrem, ut sit sensus, solum Patrem esse verum Deum; vel ad Prædicatum, ut sit sensus, Patrem esse illum Deum verum qui solus & unus est. Hic alter sensus & melius convenit cum structura verborum & consentaneus est cum aliis Sacris Literis. Neque enim propterea negatur Filius esse verus ille Deus, qui solus & unus est, quia hoc ibi affirmatur de Patre: Id quod etiam Thomas Aquinas observavit, contra Gentil. Lib. 4. c. 8. Deinde etiamsi admittatur Prima Lectio, potest tamen bisariam intelligi, nempe, aut Solum Patrem ita esse verum Deum, ut excludatur Filius & Spiritus sanctus: Sed hic sensus cum aliis Scripturis non congruit. Aut ut alia tantum omnia, quæ non sunt ejusdem cum Patre essentia, negentur esse Deus. Atque hic sensus cum aliis Scripturis pulchrè convenit.

"that

" *that True God who is Alone and One.* This latter Sense
 " doth both better agree with the Contexture of the
 " Words, and is more agreeable with other places of Scri-
 " pture: *And therefore it is not here denied that the Son is*
 " *that True God who is alone and One, because this is affirm'd*
 " here of the Father. The very same hath *Thomas Aquinas*
 " observ'd, *contra Gentil. Lib. 4. c. 8.* Again, ad-
 " mitting the first Reading of the Words, and then the
 " meaning must be, That the Father only is the True God,
 " either *so* as to exclude the Son and the Holy Ghost,
 " which is a Sense inconsistent with other places of Scri-
 " pture; or *so* as to deny all other things to be God which
 " are not of the same Essence with the Father: And this
 " Sense doth exactly well agree with the other parts of
 " Scripture." Thus *Zanchy, loc. supr. Citat.* In this last
 Sense of *Zanchy* doth *Ursin* determine, That these Words
 of our Saviour are to be taken. Amongst the various So-
 phisms which are brought by Hereticks against the True
 Divinity of the Son of God, *this* he reckons for one of the
 chiefest. And amongst the general Rules which he
 gives for answering Hereticks, he gives us One particu-
 larly for the easie answering their Argument from those
 Words of our Saviour, to prove that he is not *the only*
 True God which he says his Father is *vid. Explicat.*
Catechet. par. 2. sub. Quest. 33. By his calling the Fa-
 ther the only True God, *non excluditur à vera Deitate*
Filii, &c. " The Son is not excluded from being the
 " True God, but Idols and False Deities, to which the
 " Father, the True God is oppos'd.

And a little after, under the same Question, having put
 the Heretical Objection, from those Words of our Savi-
 our, for appropriating the Title of the Only True God
 to the Father, (which is the profess'd, great Article of
 Mr. J. B's Creed) he thus answers,

" 1st.

" 1st. There is no Opposition of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost [as if the Father were the only True God and not the Son and the Holy Ghost] but the Opposition is of the only True God, to False Gods: And therefore the Particle *μόνον*, *only*, doth not exclude the Son and the Holy Ghost, but only those things, to which the Father the True God is oppos'd.

" 2^{dly}, It is *Fallacia Divisionis*: For it follows, and *Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*: Therefore in *this* also consists Life Eternal, That Jesus Christ sent by the Father, may in like manner also with the Father be acknowledg'd *The only True God*, as St. John says, 1 Ep. 5. 20. [speaking of Christ] *This is the True God and Eternal Life*. 3^{dly}, It is a Fallacy of Composition. For the exclusive *μόνον*, *only*, doth not belong to the Subject Thee [the Father] but to the Predicate *True God*: And this the Greek Article *τις* shews, That they might know Thee *the only True God*. For the Sense is, That they might know Thee, *the Father*, to be *that God who alone is the True God*. Thus *Ursin*, thus the most Learned Dr. *Hammond* (who perhaps was as Knowing and as Orthodox a Man as himself) will tell him in *Paraph. in Loc*. "That if Men will be Partakers of this Eternal Life, *beside* the Knowledge of the Father, the only True God, they must embrace Christ and acknowledge him as the only True God also," for which he quotes, 1 Joh. 5. 20. where the same beloved Disciple, who records these Words of our Blessed Saviour, expressly determines (to the Shame and Confusion of all wicked Hereticks, and idle, ignorant, forward

1. Ibi fit oppositio non Patris, Filii & Spiritus sancti, sed Dei & Idolorum atque Creaturarum. Particula igitur *μόνον* solum non excludit à Deitate Filium & Spiritum sanctum: Sed tantum ea, quibus Pater verus Deus opponitur. 2. Est fallacia Divisionis. Sequitur enim *ὃν* quem misisti *Ἰησοῦν Christum*. Ergo in hoc etiam consistit vita aeterna, ut Jesus Christus à Patre missus similiter cognoscatur esse verus Deus, sicut dicitur [1 Joh. 5. 20.] *Hic est verus Deus & vita aeterna*. 3. Est etiam fallacia Compositionis. Nam Exclusiva *μόνον* non pertinet ad Subiectum *Τε*, sed ad Prædicatum verum Deum, quod Articulus ostendit in Græco, *ὅτι τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν*, Sensus enim est, ut cognoscant *Τε* Patrem esse Deum illum qui solus est verus Deus. *Ursin. Explicat. Catechet. Par. 2. Q. 33. p. 200.*

forward Considerers, who must needs be making of new Creeds, and appropriate the Title of *One God, only True God* to the Father Alone) *That this* [his Son Jesus Christ] *is the True God and Eternal Life*; ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός, *THE True God.* *Hic agitur non solum de vero Deo, sed de illo Uno vero Deo, ut Articulus in græco additus indicat. Catech. Rac.* And says the extraordinary Bishop Pearson upon these Words; "I can conclude no less than that our Saviour is the True God, so styl'd in the Scriptures by way of *Eminency* with an Article prefix'd, as the first Christian Writers which immediately follow'd the Apostles, did both speak and write *Expos. Creed Art. 2. p. 132.*

4thly, St. Hilary, he says, *expressly asserts this* [the Title of only True God] *to be debitum Honorem Patri.* No doubt but St. Hilary may. But what's this to his Purpose? No Body will deny it to be an Honour due to the Father. But the Question is whether it be an Honour due to the Father *only* or *alone*, exclusively of the Son and the Holy Ghost? Let him produce St. Hilary saying *that*, and then One St. Hilary may be allow'd to speak for him. 'Till then we may be satisfy'd, that St. Hilary Patronizes *this Appropriation* no more than, as he says, St. Paul does; which is, 5. His 5th. and last Argument. St. Paul, he says, *has Patroniz'd this Appropriation*, Ephes. 4. 6. *To us there is One God and Father.*

What he means by adding [*to us*] to the Text [*There is One God and Father*] I cannot tell, and I do verily believe that he cannot tell himself. But this I can tell, and am very sure of, that this is an Invincible Proof of his more than ordinary scandalous ignorance. If his adding [*to us*] signifies any thing, it must be directly against himself. It must be to restrain the Relation of God's being a Father, to *us his Creatures* or to *us Men* in particular, to *us his Children* by Creation or by Adoption, in Opposition to or by way of Distinction from his Son Christ Jesus,

Jesus, his Son by Nature, by a strictly proper, true Generation. And in truth, in this Sense is the Term [Father] here most certainly to be taken: Not for the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, *but* for the Father of all things, of all Men, or of the Elect at least; for such a Father as we invoke in our *Pater Noster*, such a Father as the Son himself and the Holy Ghost himself is: Not for the Father, the First Person of the Ever-Blessed Trinity as *distinct* from the Second Person and the Third, the Son and the Holy Ghost; but for the Father who is all Three Persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. And let him produce me one Author, if he can, who is accounted Orthodox, who doth not take the Term Father here in *this* Sense, that is, That the Title here of Father, given by St. Paul to God is not Personal but Essential, *ratione ad extra*. And if so (as most certainly *so* it is) then *this Appropriation* which, he says, St. Paul here patronizes, it is certain St. Paul here doth not patronize, but directly contrary to that which he contends for, and asserts, and cites St. Paul for, St. Paul here gives the Title of *One God* to God the Son and God the Holy Ghost, as well as to God the Father, that is, to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, not taken distinctly but conjunctly. And if this Man had but attended a little to common Sense, and to the Words which immediately follow those which he quotes, he could not but have seen this. * *There is*, says St. Paul, *One God and Father πάντων*, of All [of all Things, or of all Men] *who is above All, and through All, and in you All*. Above all by his absolute, supream Power and Dominion: So also is

ut ante ostensum est. Et sic sæpe apud Prophetas accipitur, sic etiam ad Ephes. 4. *Unus Deus & Pater omnium, qui est super omnia*: Suo scilicet absoluto & summo Imperio. At etiam Filius super omnia, Jo. 3. 31. Et per omnia: Sua scilicet Universalis Providentia per omnia diffusus Rom. 9. 5. At etiam Christus omnia agit, Heb. 1. 3. Et in omnibus vobis; Conjunctione & habitatione, per suum Spiritum. Est autem in nobis etiam Filius cum Patre: Jo. 14. 23. apparet hoc dictum Apostoli ad Solam Patris Personam non posse Restrungi. Hi. Zanch. de Tribus E bim Par. 2. Lib. 5. c. 6. p. 539.

* Dicitur autem Pater omnium, quia omnium Creator & Gubernator est. Tam Filius autem Creator est & Spiritus sanctus quam Pater

K

the

the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, God the Son, said to be *above All*, St. *John* 3. 31. *And through All*, that is, by his universal, fatherly Care and good Providence diffus'd through all things: So also is the Person of the Son, who, by this Apostle St. *Paul*, *Rom.* 9. 5. is said to be *over All*, God Blessed for ever. *Amen.* And *Heb.* 1. 3. that he upholds *All things by his Power.* And in you *All*, that is, by his gracious Conjunction with us, and Inhabitation in us by his Holy Spirit: So also is God the Son *in us* as well as God the Father, as our Blessed Lord himself tells us, St. *Job.* 14. 23. *And Jesus answer'd and said unto him, if a Man love me, he will keep my Words: And my Father will love him, and WE will come unto him and make OUR abode with him. And thus it appears,* says the Learned *Zanchy*, *That this Saying of the Apostle* [there is One God and Father] *cannot be restrain'd to the Person of the Father alone.*

And is not this then an admirable Proof that St. *Paul* patronizes this Appropriation, That the Title of One God is the proper, personal Prerogative of the Father alone? That is, That the First Person of the Ever-Blessed Trinity, the Father alone of our Lord Jesus Christ, is *One God*, because Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are so? That is, That the Father *Alone* is so, because the Father *alone* is not so? 'Tis like Mr. *J. B.*'s Way of arguing.

Now, Sir, I appeal to you (nay, I think I may to all the Orthodox World) whether, if Mr. *J. B.* will not be Orthodox with the *Animadverter* and *Bellarmin*, he may not be esteem'd an Heretick [*Arian* and *Macedonian*] without our Saviour, St. *Paul*, St. *Hilary*, and all the *Oriental Fathers*? Whether such Books as these do not call loud for a Decretum Oxoniense, for a Theological Censure from both the Universities?

Shall the Books of *Buchanan*, and *Milton*, and *Goodwin*, and *Baxter*, and *Hunton*, and *Hobbes*, and *Owen*, &c. be
justly

justly censur'd and condemn'd to Flames for *Blaspheming* the King? And shall such as these escape for *Blaspheming* the great God, the most adorable Trinity, and our most holy Religion? Shall Men be allowed to dally and play (*Stolida Procacitate*, as *Martial's* Words are) with the most tremendous Mysteries and incomprehensible Things of Faith? Shall Men be allow'd, with rude and licentious Hands, to break down the sacred Inclosures of our Faith, that *Hedge of Thorns* (as I remember the Reverend Dean well calls it in his Apology) and endeavour with a kind of Sacrilege, to dispossess and rob the Church of those Terms and Distinctions she hath been so long in Possession of, and with which she hath so long *successfully* defended her Faith of a *Holy Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity*?

Have these Primitive Terms and Distinctions (long before ever the School-men were in Being) been always sufficient to encounter with, and effectually to baffle and defeat the most numerous and most subtle Hereticks, or no? If not, then, it seems, that which we call the Catholick Faith in this Article, hath been all along till now, a baffled, indefensible Faith. If they have (as most certainly they have) why are they not as sufficient now, as they have been all along? What need have we of *Self-Consciousness and Mutual Consciousness, and Three distinct, infinite Minds or Spirits*?

In Reference to the Sacred Articles of Religion (saith Mr. J. B. [Book p. 65.] and it is the best thing said in his whole Book, in which I heartily agree with him) we ought to have a double Care, not only to think but speak inoffensively. To take Care that our Words as well as our Opinions be Orthodox; and especially ought we to be thus cautious in the mysterious Articles of the Trinity and Incarnation; where a Word disorder'd, I had almost said a Comma displac'd, may render us in the Judgment of the warm, contending Parties, guilty of no less than Heresie. 'Tis Sr. Augu-

stin's Observation concerning the Mystery of the Trinity, That nec Periculosius alicubi erratur, nec laboriosius aliquid quaeritur. It is no where more dangerous to err, nor more difficult to apprehend than in this mysterious Subject. A wise Person will have a great Care to keep the beaten Path, to speak in the receiv'd Language of the Church. The Learned Calvin gives us his own Experience, Expertus pridem sum, & quidem sapius, quicunq; de verbis pertinacius litigant, fovere occultum virus. That they who obstinately quarrel against the Phrases of the Church, are Hereticks in their Hearts.

I have no hard Thoughts of the Reverend Dean, God knows my Heart. No Man hath a truer Honour and Veneration for him than my self. I only wish he had taken *this double Care, not only to think but to speak inoffensively.* I wish he had taken a greater Care to keep the beaten Path, to speak in the receiv'd Language of the Church; and then, who can doubt, but that he who hath so admirably well acquitted himself against our Popish Adversaries, who hath so baff'd and triumph'd over our dissenting Adversaries; and who hath been such a severe and just Scourge to *Protestant Reconcilers, Trimmers and Comprehension-Men*; who can doubt but that he would have had the same Glory and Success against our Socinian Adversaries?

But to undertake a Defence of the Catholick Faith, of a Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity, by *Self-Consciousness* and *Mutual Consciousness* (however ingenious it may be, however defensible it may be) is going a new and unusual Way to work, or at least with new and unusual Terms, contrary to a common and good Rule in Divinity, *Nova & Insolita Locutiones in Mysteriorum Fidei non sunt usurpanda.*

But to assert Three distinct, infinite Minds, or Spirits, whatever *Genebrard*, One School-man, may say;

as

as Learned and a more Orthodox Man than he pronounces, "*Certe Perniciosum Dogma est Tres constituere Spiritus aternos & distinctos. Nam Januam aperit non solum ad Arianismum, sed Palam Gentilismum sapit.*" *Benedict. Aretius Loc. Theolog. Loc. 1. p. 4.* It is certainly, says he, a *Pernicious* Doctrine to constitute Three eternal, distinct Spirits: For it not only opens a Door to *Arianism*, but it *plainly* relishes of *Heathenism*.

Virandi sunt
omnes modi
loquendi, qui

Hæreticis vel in *Speciem* favere videntur. Qui igitur de Tribus Personis adorandæ Trinitatis loquuntur, ii uti non debent supradicto loquendi modo, dicentes eas esse Tres Substantias, ne favere videantur Arianis, Macedonianis, Valentino Gentili, & ejus Sectatoribus. *Rob. Baronii Philos. Theol. Ancillans, Exercitat. 1. Artic. 9. p. 41.*

The Reverend Dean himself, as well as Mr. *J. B.* (notwithstanding what his *Genebrard* says) allows it to be *new and unusual*, and therefore, be sure, to assert it and insist upon it, is not, as Mr. *J. B.* gravely advises, it is not to have a *great* Care to keep the beaten Path, to speak in the *receiv'd* Language of the Church, which, he says, *a wise Person will do.*

If the Reverend Dean means no more by Three distinct, infinite Minds or Spirits, than Three distinct, infinite Persons, why should he alter the constant, universal Language of the Church? Why should he not be satisfied with asserting a Trinity only of Three Divine Persons, which in an ineffable, incomprehensible Manner, are One infinite Spirit or God? Why should Occasion be given to the Enemies of the Tri-*Une* God, and our most Holy Religion to blaspheme? Cannot a Trinity of Divine Persons in One infinite undivided Essence be defended, unless we assert Three distinct, infinite Minds or Spirits? How hath it been defended all along hitherto?

But this is not the worst of it. That which I chiefly mean, that which calls loudest for a *Decretum Oxoniense*, for a Theological Censure from both the Universities, is the foul, pernicious Spirit of Latitudinarianism, which
being

being transform'd, by an infernal Artifice, appears much abroad like an Angel of Light, like the only Complaisant, Sober, Moderate, Peaceable, Healing Angel. But Sheep's Clothing is such a common Disguise, and worn so very thin, that we can easily look through it and see the ravening Wolf under. If the false Prophets will be playing their juggling Tricks, we need not be deceiv'd by them, unless we will our selves.

Matt. 7. 13,
15, 16.

Our Blessed Saviour, who would have us enter in at the *strait* Gate, and to go the *narrow* Way which leadeth unto Life, and to avoid, as we would Death, the *wide* Gate and the *Lasitudinarian* Way, which, he saith, *leadeth to Destruction*; hath commanded us to *beware of false Prophets*, and that we may know them, he hath given us a certain, infallible Direction *by their Fruits*, that is, as the Word [Fruits] is certainly here to be understood, by their Designs and Doctrine.

Behold then *the working of the Mystery of Iniquity*, ἐνέργεια πλάνης, the vehement, the subtle, the underhand working of the Mystery of Iniquity.

After a long (but blessed be God hitherto vain and fruitless) Attack upon our Out-works and incomparable Liturgy, we find at last Men at work to *Sap* the very Foundation of our Church, to undermine and subvert the Fundamental Doctrine of a *Trinity of Divine Persons in the Unity of the Divine Essence*, and so to pull down not only the Church of *England*, but the Holy Catholick Church all at once.

It must be dangerous to charge my good Lord Bishop of *Sarum* with having any Hand in this, because he is a Peer of the Realm, and therefore I *here Declare* I do not.

But I hope I may be permitted to ask a civil Question or Two without Offence, though some may think I look askint upon my Lord.

What

What can any Man mean, in a State of this Controversy, to call the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost Three Persons, *as the Opinion of a Third Party of Men*; but when he comes to speak of *them* himself, to call 'em *the Blessed Three*, and to assign 'em only such a general Distinction, as, for what I know, will agree to the Hypothesis of any Heretick whatsoever, that ever yet appear'd against a Trinity of Divine Persons, as believ'd by the Holy Catholic Church? What Sabellian, Arian, Macedonian, Socinian, Anti-Trinitarian of any Sort, will stick to call the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost the Blessed Three? Some will have them to be the Blessed Three, but not Three distinct Persons, but only Three Names for One and the same God. Some will have 'em to be the Blessed Three, but not One and the same God: And others will have 'em to be Three distinct Gods. However such Men as these tell us what they mean, and what they would have.

But what can that Man mean, who though he may now and then for Fashion's Sake (that is, for the Sake of Trimming) call 'em Three Persons, yet in a Catechetical, Decisive Discourse to the Clergy, shall plainly affect to call 'em *the Blessed Three*? Why not the Three Blessed Persons, according to the constant Language and Faith of the Church? * Why "That, my Reverend Brethren, (may such a Man say) is a doubtful, disputed Case. Call 'em only the Blessed Three, and then you are surē; then you speak the true Latitudinarian Language; then you are sure, that is, to be on the sunny Side of the Hedge; then you are sure to offend none of the Three Parties [But that, say I, is a Mistake, my Reverend

* The Reason which the Animadverter, on Mr. Hill's Book, gives why the Bishop of Sarum, in a late Discourse of his, doth not every where make use of the Word Person, which is consecrated by so long a Custom in the Church; and why he does more frequently say the Blessed Three, is, because they are not call'd Persons in Scripture, and the Arians and Socinians look upon it as Foreign, and which, the Foreign Doctor himself says, needs to be sofin'd to give it a Sense free from Absurdity in the Matter of the Trinity, and that it serves only to render the Dispute intricate. Vid. Animadversions on Mr. Hill's Book, p. 4, 5.

1 COR 10. 32.

*verend Brethren, For though it may be no Offence to the
 Jews nor to the Gentiles, &c. Yet a very grievous Offence, I am
 very sure, it is to the Church of God, to allow Men a Li-
 berty (as the Case of the Church now stands) to express their
 Faith in the Trinity at this loose Rate; to stile the Father,
 Son, and Holy Ghost the Blessed Three: For that may sig-
 nifie Three mere Modes, or Three Names only, Three Some-
 whats, e'en what Men please]* the Ancient Fathers, indeed,
 "were pleased universally to call 'em the Three Blessed
 "Persons, or something equivalent to the calling them
 "Three Persons, which inferr'd a *Real Personal Distin-*
 "*ction.* But they, too many of them and the Moderns
 "too, in their Defence of the Holy Catholick Faith against
 "those they call'd Hereticks, have perhaps gone beyond
 "due Bounds; nay, it may be justly questioned, whether
 "[by what they have deliver'd down to us concerning
 "this Mystery] they have made it better to be under-
 "stood or more firmly believ'd, or whether others have
 "not taken Advantage to represent these Subtilties as
 "Dregs either of *Æones*, of the *Valentinians*, or of the
 "Platonick Notions. And it being long before these
 "Theories were well stated and settled, it is no Wonder
 "if many of the Fathers have not only differ'd from One
 "another, but even from themselves in speaking upon this
 "Argument. When Men go about to explain a thing,
 "of which they can have no distinct Idea; it is very na-
 "tural for them to run out into *vauſt* Multiplicity of
 "Words; into great Length and much Darkneſs and
 "Confuſion. Many impertinent Similes will be urg'd,
 "and often impertinent Reasonings will be made use of,
 "all which are the unavoidable Conſequences of a Man's
 "going about to explain to others what he does not di-
 "ſtinctly underſtand himſelf. And ſo the Fathers are to
 "be caſhier'd, not to be regarded in this Matter. What
 "Matter is it what a parcel of old, doating, Doctors ſay,
 "who

“ who have gone beyond due Bounds, contradicted each other,
 “ and themselves, who use many impertinent Similes, run out
 “ into a vaust Length and Confusion; while they talk of things
 “ to others which they understand not themselves. Besides
 “ too these Fathers were no Latitudinarians. They were
 “ a Sort of strait-lac’d, stiff, old, Gentlemen, who hated
 “ what we call Trimming mortally; and could never be
 “ perswaded for the Sake of Comprehension, to sacrifice
 “ any part of the Doctrine or Discipline of the Church to
 “ the Caprice of Sabellians or Arians, Novatians or Do-
 “ natists, or any Hereticks or Schismatics whatsoever.

Very agreeably to this, out came Animadversions on Mr. Hill’s Book, Intituled, A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers, &c. In a Letter to a Person of Quality: Which Person of Quality, as a French Divine in our Neighbourhood reports, is my Lord Bishop of Sarum, who order’d it to be Translated out of its Original French into English, and to be Printed.

In which Letter these Ignorant, Impertinent, Self-Contradicting Old Fathers, without any Reverence or Regard to their Venerable Grey Hairs, are run down and troden under Foot most wofully: And the Author of it, like a good, humble, fawning Creature very devoutly Sacrifices the Primitive Fathers to his Maker the Bishop, and very impiously gives them up to the Hereticks.

Dr. Bull, he says [*Animadvers. p. 32.*] and some Learned Men indeed, have endeavour’d to give a good Sense to their Expressions, and by a long Compass of Consequences to reduce them to the Ordinary Notions. But it will not do. Notwithstanding all Dr. Bull’s Endeavours to reduce what the Fathers say [concerning the Trinity] to an Orthodox Sense, p. 52. They were certainly Hereticks, as bad Hereticks as those they oppos’d, for all that. For, says this prophane *Patrum Mastix*, p. 51. Most of the Fathers from the middle of the Second Century to the Council of Nice, were

~~engag'd in Opinions contrary to the right Notion we have of the Doctrine of the Trinity, as Petavius confesses it. And therefore 'tis one thing to be mis'd, he says in the same Page, That Mr. Hill had not inspir'd his Readers with so profound a Veneration for Antiquity; which I am sure our Holy Mother the Church of England ever had, and hath, (and 'tis her Glory) and justly obliges all her Children, her Ministers especially, to have. *~~

* Imprimis vero videbunt, ne quid unquam doceant pro

concione, quod à Populo religiosè teneri & credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit Doctrinæ veteris aut novi Testamenti, quodque ex illa ipsa Doctrina Catholici Patres & veteres Episcopi collegerint. Qui secus fecerit, & contraria Doctrina Populum turbaverit, excommunicabitur. Liber quorundam Canonum Discip. Ec. Ang. An. 1571. Sub Tit. Concionatores. I take it for granted that this Canon extends to Books as well as Sermons, and then quere whether, according to this excellent Canon of our Church, Mr. Hill cannot justify what he says in p. 6, 7. of his Book, for which this Animadverter fanatically charges him with Popery? And whether, according to the same Canon, this Animadverting Foreigner (advanced as it were for a Purpose) ought not to be Animadverted upon, and to be made a Foreigner in a worse Sense than he was before; that is, to be Excommunicated out of our Church.

Indeed, in what this Animadverter here says, he speaks somewhat sily, and his Words may possibly be taken in *Sensu Favouris*, Hypothetically only: But what he says before, precludes such an Interpretation and forbids the Favour. For in that he is Categorical, That several of the Ancient Fathers were Tritheists, and the reverend Dean of St. Paul's a Tritheist too. That's out of doubt with him. And therefore, says he, p. 41. I agree with him [Mr. Hill] when he tells us, that he cannot conceive Three Minds in God, without establishing Tritheism. But, says he, he [Mr. Hill] is absolutely mistaken, when he denies that several of the Ancients have acknowledged Three Minds in God. And if to be Three Minds is to be Three Substances, that's as clear too as the Day, that the Fathers own'd Three Substances in God. Nothing, says he, is more evident than that MOST of the Fathers have acknowledged Three Substances. This, he says, he can soon demonstrate, if he will, that is, I suppose, if the Bishop will have him. And if Mr. Hill, or any Body else shall dare to speak a Word against his Bishop

shop for the future, for reflecting upon, or saying what he pleases of the Ancient Fathers, the Monsieur, who, he says, is *almost tempted* to do it already, will then, no doubt, be able to hold no longer, from *Drawing such a Picture of Antiquity* [with Relation to its Faith in the Holy Trinity] *as shall not be much to its Advantage*, p. 31.

This is certainly a very Formidable, Dangerous Man, and I hope it will be a Warning to Mr. Hill, and all others to take Care, for the Sake of the Ancient Fathers, how they provoke him or his Bishop.

But our Prefacer here, Mr. J. B. advances yet further in this Work of Darkness, and under a false Pretence of defending the Catholick Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity against the Objections of the Socinians, and of defending the Dean of St. Paul's (by a Book which, I dare say, that truly Worthy, and deservedly Admir'd Person, did neither encourage nor approve of) doth not only publish such a Profession of his Faith, as, I am sure, there is not a Socinian in England, but what will readily own and subscribe to; but with unparalleld Ignorance, or *something worse*, brings the Nicene Council, All the Oriental Fathers, St. Hilary, our Blessed Saviour, and his Blessed Apostle St. Paul to vouch it; that is, That the Father Alone is the One only True God, the God whom the Heathen Philosophers by the Light of Nature, and the Jews by Revelation worshipped, who, he believes was One Divine Person, and but One Divine Person. For he doth, he says, most firmly believe the Unity of God AS it was believ'd by the wisest of the Heathens, and the Jewish Church, who, sure enough, believ'd the One God to be but One Divine Person: And therefore, though there be Gods many and Lords many [falsly so call'd] and though Christ may be call'd God, and the Holy Ghost God [that can be only metaphorically, for] to US [Mr. J. B. and his Co-Believers] there is but One only True God, the Father Alone. And,

This is the Bottom upon which his suitable Doctrine, here in his Preface, stands, *viz.* *That the First Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Father is adequately and convertibly predicated of God, but the Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are not*; that is (and All the Earth, I am sure, cannot make any thing else of it) the One True God is the Father *alone*, but the One True God (according to the Catholick Faith) is not Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. *The Scriptures prove the former, and 'tis downright Blasphemy to deny it: And the Scriptures confuse the latter, and 'tis downright Blasphemy (as he undertakes to prove it) to assert it.*

This, I think, appears plainly to be his Faith as he hath deliver'd it, and which he decretorily establishes with a kind of Anathema. And,

If *This* be his Faith, if *This* be his Doctrine, can the Universities, or can the Governours of our Church be unconcern'd to stigmatize such a Believer, and to condemn by publick Censure, such Doctrine as this is, from a Man that writes himself A. M. and Presbyter of the Church of England? Can we be less concern'd *to render to God the things that are God's, than to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's*? I hope not.

Certainly, however such Authors as this may escape for some time, there *will* come a Day of Reckoning for them here as well as hereafter.

Buchanan and Knox, and Goodman, and Parsons, &c. were gone long before; but yet a *Decretum Oxoniense* at last overtook them, and justly condemned their Books to lie in Infamous Ashes with their Authors.

And now, Sir, to conclude this great Trouble I have given you. I know you utterly dislike all harsh, tart, calumnious Language in the Management of Controversies of Religion: But I know too, That no Man is more for taking down Pride and Insolence than your self, and for
taking

taking the wife Man's Direction, upon so just an Occasion as this certainly is, to answer a *Man* according to his *Way*, lest he be wise in his own Conceit *. And this Rule, * Prov. 26. 9. I hope, I have not transgress'd, and that it will therefore, with my God, with you and with all the equal and impartial, be my Apology for my Way of Writing.

I do, Sir, heartily wish with you that the Acute and Learned Mr. *Hill*, in his Vindication of the Primitive Fathers (which, God knows, they never wanted more) had treated the Bishop of *Sarum* with more Regard to his great Character, and had better consider'd that *Michael* the Arch-Angel, when contending with the Devil, he disputed about the Body of *Moses*, durst not bring against him a railing Accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee †. † Jude 9. And more heartily do I wish, with you, That the unquestionably Ingenious, and Learned Animadverter, if he must be exercising his Satyr, had kept it all for *Oliver Cromwell*, all Regicides, Rebels, Fanaticks, and the like Sinners, (upon whom he hath bestow'd it plentifully and perhaps plausibly enough) and had treated the Reverend Dean more humanely and christianly, with a more due Regard to his Former, Meritorious Services for our Church and Religion; and to that Character, which he deservedly hath in the Church, and I hope will have a greater. And if the Animadverter had done so, I am apt to think that his Arguments against the Dean had gone a great deal further, and that therefore he may take his ill Language the better and thank him for't.

But now, as for this Mr. *J. B.* *what must we say*, to use his own Words [Book p. 133.] *when a Person shall set up for a Critick in the most mysterious Article of our Religion, and himself understands not the First Elements of Divinity?* When such a Person shall undertake, after an insolent Manner, to Chastize the Animadverter, and through his whole Preface and Book, shall be perpetually insulting over

over and vilifying a Man for understanding nothing of Logick or Divinity, who, let him be what he will else, hath been a long while celebrated for a zealous, always stedfast Son of the Church of *England*, and for a Man of great Parts and Learning, which he, I'll engage, never will? When such a Person shall be so unsufferably conceited and vain, as to think himself not only an Over-Match for the Animadverter, but for St. *Augustin*, the Master of the Sentences, and all the School-men and Moderns who are their Followers? Who after he hath singl'd out *the Acute and Learned St. Augustin*, as he calls him, p. 58. for a confuted, baffled Man by him, and exposed him and mock'd him, as a bold, ignorant, shuffling Father, and run down, despis'd, and ridicul'd the Subtilties of the Schools, which, 'tis certain, he hath not Brains to understand, though others have; shall expose and ridicule the Holy Scriptures themselves, and ignorantly pervert them to Sense, which, 'tis certain were never intended by them; and shall undertake to publish such a Profession of his Faith as is utterly inconsistent with the Catholick, and under a Pretence of defending the Trinity, shall ignorantly or treacherously betray it, and as St. *Peter* says, shall privily bring in damnable Heresies, even denying the Lord that bought him, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. *What shall we say?* Shall such a Person be complemented? Was soft Language ever created for such a Man? Who then can deserve to be rebuk'd *sharply*? *Tit.* 1. 3.

I do not, I am sure I cannot, expose and chastize him as he deserves, or as the Reverend Dean did the Protestant Reconciler in his Excellent *Vindication of the Rights of Ecclesiastical Authority*; and therefore I hope, I shall not fall under your Displeasure for borrowing this Man's hard Words, and applying them upon Occasion, more suitably to himself, and justly lashing him [my Equal] with his own Rod (with which he so irreverently and unjustly presumes to correct,

correct, in all Respects, his Superiour) in *Vindication of the Rights of Heaven*, of the Holy and Eternal Jesus, and the Ever-Blessed Spirit of God, who with the Father, according to the Catholick Faith, are adequately and convertibly predicated of the One True God, which he, in *Terminis*, blasphemously denies, and impiously says that the *Scriptures* confute. I am, Sir, most sincerely,

Your very Affectionate,

very Humble Servant,

T. H.

A POST-

A POSTSCRIPT to the READER.

I Had written a great Part of this Letter to my reverend Friend Mr. R. E. without any the least Thoughts, God knows, of making it publick. But upon a Serious Post-Confideration, that it may be a means (which I am sure, will be a good Piece of Service to our Church and Religion) to divert Mr. J. B. from any further Prosecution of a Design, which, I think, I have fully prov'd and satisfy'd you (and, I hope, Mr. J. B. himself) he is altogether unfit and unqualify'd for; and to oblige him *for Shame* not to think of Publishing his *Threaten'd Second Part of the Unity of God*, or at least to be more cautious in it, that the Church may not be scandaliz'd and pester'd with any more of *his Hasty Births*; I **Resolv'd** to let it go abroad with *This Protestation*.

That I have no manner of Knowledge of this Mr. J. B. but by his Book. That therefore what I have said of or against him, is not out of any personal Pique, Grudge, or Ill-will I bear him, but (what I beg the candid Reader in his Christian Charity to me to believe) *purely* out of an honest, sincere Zeal for the Glory of the Holy and Eternal Trinity, *As 'tis reveal'd to us in the Holy Bible*, according to the constant Sense and Interpretation of the Holy Catholick Church, from the Holy Apostles Days to our own: And particularly of our Holy Mother the Church of *England*, in the First Article of her Religion, and in her incomparable Liturgy; which I beseech God of his infinite Mercy, to preserve intire to us from *All* clandestine Designs and Practices, and *All* open Assaults and Violations of *All* fickle, new-fangled Teachers and Reformers: To which, I am sure, every true, zealous, stedfast Son of the Church of *England*, will most heartily and devoutly say with me, *Amen, Amen.*

F I N I S

